Were the Khazars Israelites?

On the Ethnicity of Khazars in Hebrew and Chinese Sources

Discussion Paper

Dr. Howard HS Chung

October 16, 2021

hschung.hsc@gmail.com

Conclusion:

The Schechter letter reveals 3 important facts:

1. The Gök-Turks had a holy script which the rabbis from Baghdad could identify as Torah.

2. The Tiele people living in Dagestan at the time of the Khazars' arrival were part of the scattered Xiongnus who had emigrated from China; this people had a rudimentary Israelitism.

3. The Kingdom of Khazsaria arose from the unification of three Israelite peoples: Gök-Turks, Tiele-Xiongnus and Jews from Baghdad. The unification took place through the revelation of the existence of Torah which the Khazars had in possession.

Table of Content

Introduction....3

1. The Schechter Letter in Full Length....6

2. The Roots of the Khazars....11

2.1 Turks are descendants of the Xiongnus....13

2.2 Turk = derekh דרך....15

3 The Arrival of the Khazars in Dagestan according to Jiu Tang Shu (舊唐書) and Sui Shu (隋書)....19

4. The Repentance of the Khazars....22

4.1 The Competition of Religions....23

4.2 The Judges - the Greats of Khazaria....24

4.3 Course of the Competition in the Letter of King Joseph....25

4.4 Judgement by the Torah....26

Comments from Academia.edu Session....42

Further reading:

https://www.academia.edu/106356973/Dispersion_of_the_Israelites_in_the_Eurasian_Continent

Introduction

The phenomenon of the medieval Jewish state of Khazsaria (650–969) poses many puzzles to historians. The biggest and most important is the question about the ethnicity of the Khazars: Were they really Jews or "only" Turks who converted to Judaism?

The Arab historian al-Masudi (died 957) wrote:

"The king of the Khazars had already become a Jew at the time of the caliphate of Harun al-Rashid, and Jews from all countries of Islam and from the land of the Greeks had moved to him."[1]

Hasdai ibn Shaprut, a Jewish doctor and secretary at the court of the Caliph of Cordoba, expressed his delight at the existence of a Jewish state in a letter (written between 950 and 960) to the King of Khazaria:

"I always ask the ambassadors of these monarchs who bring gifts, about our brethren the Israelites, the remnant of the captivity, whether they have heard anything concerning the deliverance of those who have languished in bondage and have found no rest. At length mercantile emissaries of Khorasan told me that there is a kingdom of Jews which is called Al-Chazar. But I did not believe these words for I thought that they told me such things to procure my goodwill and favor. I was therefore wondering, till the ambassadors of Constantinople came with presents and a letter from their king to our king, and I interrogated them concerning this matter. They answered me: "It is quite true, and the name of that kingdom is Al-Chazar. It is a fifteen days' journey by sea from Constantinople, but by land many nations intervene between us; the name of the king now reigning is Joseph; ships sometimes come from their country to ours bringing fish, skins, and wares of every kind. The men are our confederates and are honored by

us; there is communication between us by embassies and mutual gifts; they are very powerful; they maintain numerous armies with which they occasionally engage in expeditions. When I heard this report I was encouraged, my hands were strengthened, and my hope was confirmed. Thereupon I bowed down and adored the God of heaven. "[2]

Who were the Khazars?

The Byzantine authors leave no doubts as to the ethnicity of the Khazars: They believed the Khazars were Turks.

Theophanes the Confessor called them "East Turks", as opposed to "West Turks", with which name he associated the Magyars, the ancestors of the Hungarians. In the Georgian Chronicles they were referred to as "West Turks"[3].

The fact that the Khazars became Jewish could be attributed to their converting to Judaism as a religion. They weren't born Jews. This fact would not be problematic in itself, since the conversion of a gentile to Judaism is considered permissible by the Jews themselves. It becomes problematic, however, if one follows up the history of the Khazars after the destruction of their state by the Russians. The Khazars were by no means completely destroyed by the Russians, but continued to live under Russian rule in their homeland. It was not until the Mongol invasion of 1224 that the Khazars were driven from their tribal homeland to Eastern Europe and Russia. From there, as far as they had survived the Holocaust of World War II, they reached today's land of Israel.

A large part of the Jews living in Israel today (the Ashkenazi Jews) would therefore be descendants of the Khazars. This creates a (religious) legitimation problem for the State of Israel, as this would mean that their ancestors were Turks who converted to Judaism, which means that their biblical right to live in Harez Israel is not a valid claim.

But is it really so? It looks very different if the Turks could be qualified as Israelites, that is, as descendants of Jacob.

The present author believes that the Israelites flourished in China during the Spring and Autumn Era and that groups of the Israelites left China during following great civil wars towards west, to Central Asia, centered in Samarkand, they spread to Europe and India. They came as powerful groups against whom the inhabitants of the affected areas could not defy. The Khazars also belonged to an association of Israelites who emigrated from China. You were part of the Turkish association. In Khazaria (today's Dagestan) they met exiled Jews from Bagdad after more than 1000 years of separation. Amazingly, the Chinese Israelites had changed so little that they placed themselves under the direction of the rabbis from Bagdad.Together they founded a Jewish state and lived under the Mosaic Law for almost 200 hundred years.

Two documents from this period support this thesis. It is the so-called "Schechter Letter"[4] and the "Letter of King Joseph"[5].

The Schechter Letter is a document discovered by Solomon Schechter in Cairo and was published in 1912, written in perfect Hebrew by an unknown author. Only a small part of the manuscript has survived, and this itself has been so disintegrated that it contains many gaps. Schechter filled in these gaps in his own words and put them in square brackets. He admits that these are only his suggestions and that he is by no means sure that they are correct. In terms of content, it is a letter from a Khazarian author to an unknown Jewish addressee. Historians believe that the addressee was Hasdai ibn Shaprut, the doctor and secretary at the court of the Caliph of Cordoba.

King Joseph's letter is also from the same collection of documents from Genizah in Cairo, a warehouse of the Ben Ezra Synagogue, in which over 300,000 Jewish fragments were discovered. This letter was found in Cairo by a Jewish merchant named Abraham Akrish and was published in Constantinople in 1577. In this letter, King Joseph (actually Khagan Joseph) replies to a letter from Hasdai ibn Shaprut; the writing can be dated between 950 and 960.

1. The Schechter Letter in Full Length

1 - Armenia and our ancestors fled from them. . . .. [for they could not]

2 - bear the yoke of the worshipers of idols. And [the princes of Khazaria] received them [for the men of]

3 - Khazaria were first without Torah. And [they too] remained without

4 - Torah and Scriptures and made marriage with the inhabitants of the land [and mingled with them.]

5 - And they learned their deeds and went out with them [to the war continually.]

6 - And they became [one] people. Only upon the covenant of circumcision they relied. And [some of them]

7- observed the Sabbath. [1] And there was no king in the land of Khazaria. Only

8 - him who won victories in the battle they would appoint over them as general

9 - of the army. Now (it happened) at one time when the Jews went forth into the battle with them as

10 - was their wont that on that day a Jew proved mighty with his sword and put to flight

11 - the enemies who came against Khazaria. Then the people of Khazaria appointed him over them as general

12 - of the army in accordance with their ancient custom[6] . And such was the state of their affairs for many days;

13 - until the Lord had mercy and awakened the heart of the prince to do repentance.

14 -For his wife, whose name was Sarah, turned him and taught him profitably. And hey then

15 - consented, for he was circumcised. But also the father of the young woman, a righteous man in that generation,

16 - taught him the way of life. And it came to pass that when the kings of Macedon

17 - and the kings of Arabia heard of these things, they waxed exceeding wroth. And they sent

18 - messengers to the princes of Khazaria with words of blasphemy against Israel, saying:

19 - “What mean ye by returning to the belief of the Jews who are subject under

20 - the hands of all the nations? " And they spake words which are not for us to tell. And they turned the

21- heart of the princes to evil. Then said the great prince, the Jew: “To what end,

22 - increase words? Let there come (men) of the wise men of Israel and of the wise men of Greece,

23 - and of the wise men of Arabia. And let everyone of them tell before us and before you.

24 - [the work of his God and we shall see] the end. " And they did so and he sent

25- [messengers to the kings of Greece] and to the kings of Arabia. But the wise men of Israel also offered themselves

26 - [to come to the aid of the men of] Khazaria. There upon the Greeks opened with their testimony

27- . . . . . .and the Jews and the Arabians began to contradict them. And after this

28- [the Arabians bore witness] and the Jews and the Greeks contradicted them. And then opened

29- [the wise men of Israel their testimony] telling from the days of the creation, until the day when the children of Israel came up

30- from Egypt, and until they arrived at an inhabited country. (To the truth of this), the Greeks

31- as well as the Arabians bore witness and confirmed it, but there arose also dissension amongst them.

32- Then said the princes of Khazaria, “Behold, there is a cave in the valley of Tizul. Bring forth for us

33- the books which are there and explain them to us. " And they did so and went

34- into the cave. And behold, there were there Books of the Law of Moses, and the wise men of Israel explained them

35- in accordance with the words which they spake first. Then

36- Israel, together with the men of Khazaria, returned in perfect repentance. But also the Jews began

37- to come from Baghdad, from Khorasan and from the land of Greece and strengthened the hands of the men of

38- the land, and encouraged themselves in the covenant of the Father of the Multitude. And the men of the land appointed over them

39- one of the wise men as judge. And they call his name in the tongue of

40- Khazaria, Khagan. Therefore, the judges who arose after him are called by the name

41- Khagan, even unto this day [7] . As to the great prince of Khazaria, they turned his name into

42- Sabriel and they made him king over them. Now they say in our land

43- that our ancestors came from the tribe of Simeon, but we are not able to probe

44- the truth of the matter. Now the king made peace with our neighbor, the king of the Alani,

45- because the kingdom of the Alani is the strongest and the hardest of all the nations that surround us.

46- For the wise men said, “Read when the nations shall rise up to wage war against us

47- He also join unto our enemies. "Therefore [he concluded peace with him to help]

48- one another in distress. And there was the terror of God [upon the nations which]

49- surround us. And they came not against the kingdom of Khazaria. [But in the day of] the king [Benjamin]

50 - all the nations rose up against [the men of Khazaria] and brought them into straits [according to the counsel]

51- of the king of Macedon. And there went to battle the king of Asia [and Turkey]. . . . .

52- . . . . and Painil and Macedon. Only the king of the Alani was in support of [Khazaria.]

53- For some of them observed the Torah of the Jews. [All] these kings

54- waged was against Khazaria. But the king of the Alani went against their land [and smote them with slaughter,] so

55 - that they could not recover. And the Lord smote them before the king Benjamin. But it also happened in the days of king Aaron

56 - that the king of the Alani fought against Khazaria, for the king of Greece incited him.

57 - But Aaron hired against him the king of Turkey [for he was then his friend.][8] And the king of the

58 - Alani fell before Aaron who caught him alive. But [the king] honored him [very much] and took

59 - his daughter as wife for his son Joseph. Thereupon the king of the Alani swore unto him in truth.

60 - and Aaron the king sent him [to his house]. And from that day there fell the fear

6I - of Khazaria upon the nations which surrounded them. And also in the days of my lord, the king Joseph

62- . . . . . when there was the persecution in the days of the wicked Romanus [9] .

63 - [And the matter became known] to my lord he trod down many of the uncircumcised. But Romanus, [the wicked,] also

64 - sent great gifts to Helgu, the king of Russia[10] , and enticed him

65 - for his own evil, and he came in the night upon the province of the Sewerians and took it by deception.

66 - For the commander, the head of the princes, was not there. But when the matter became known to Bulshazi

67 - or Pesah, the Reverer, he marched against the cities of Romanus in fierce anger and smote

68 - both man and woman. And he took three cities be sides the hamlets

69 - very many. And from there he marched against Shorshu ... .. and fought against it;

70 - . . . . And there came out of the earth like worms

7I - . . . . Israel and there died ninety men of them

72 - . . . . . But he made them serve under tribute and saved

73 - . . . . [from] the hands of Russia. [And he took] all those to be found of them

74- . . . . [sword] and from there he went out to battle against Helgu and he fought

75- . . . . months and God subdued him before Pesah and he found

76- . . . . of the plunder which he took from the Sewerians, but he said, “Romanus

77- beguiled me (to do) this. " Then Pesah said to him, “If this be so, march against Romanus

78 - and fight against him as you didst fight against me, and I will depart from thee, but if not, here

79- I shall die or live until I shall have taken vengenance, ”And thus he marched against his own will

80- and fought against Constantinople four months on sea. And his mighty men fell

81- there. For the Macedonians prevailed over him by fire. And he lied but was ashamed to return to

82- his country. And he went to Persia by the sea and he fell there, he and all his camp.

83- Then the Russian became subdued under the hands of the Khazar[11] . Behold, I.

84- make it known to my lord that the name of our land as we found it in books is

85- Arkanus, and the name of the royal city is Khazar, and the name of the river that passes

86- through its midst is Atel and it is south of the sea that comes from. . . . . .. through which

87- thy messengers came to Constantinople. And I believe that

88- it starts from the Great Sea. But our province is distant from that sea

89- two thousand and one hundred and sixty ris, and between our land and Constantinople

90- is nine days by sea and twenty-eight days by land,

9I- and the land of the dominion of my lord is fifty days. Behold, (these are) those who fight against us.

92- Asia, Bab al abwab, Zibus, Turkey, and Luznu.

2. The Roots of the Khazars

1 - Armenia and our ancestors fled from them. . . .. [for they could not]

2 - bear the yoke of the worshipers of idols. And [the princes of Khazaria] received them [for the men of] | with them.]

5 - And they learned their deeds and went out with them [to the war continually.]

6 - And they became [one] people. Only upon the covenant of circumcision they relied. And [some of them]

7- observed the Sabbath. "

" Our ancestors"

Here the question arises as to what ethnicity "our ancestors" were. The King-Joseph letter is clear in this regard, the letter is provided with the heading:

"THE LETTER OF JOSEPH THE KING, SON OF AARON THE KING, THE TURK - MAY HIS CREATOR PRESERVE HIM - TO THE HEAD OF THE ASSEMBLY, HASDAI, THE SON OF ISAAC, SON OF EZRA."

Joseph describes himself as the king of the Turks. To underline his Turkish ethnicity, he introduces his ancestry:

"Know that we are descended from Japhet, through his son Togarmah. I have found in the genealogical books of my ancestors that Togarmah had ten sons. These are their names: the eldest was Ujur, the second Tauris, the third Avar, the fourth Uguz, the fifth Bizal, the sixth Tarna, the seventh Chazar, the eighth Janur, the ninth Bulgar, the tenth Sawir. "

King Joseph seems to have taken the rabbinical doctrine of the descency of the Turks from Japhet to heart. However, the biblical lineage from Japhet to Khazar is only four generations, so too short in every respect. Japhet, Gomer (Gen. 10, 2), Togarmah (Gen. 10, 3) and Chazar. The names mentioned as the 10 sons of Togarmah actually represent many of the Turkish peoples known to us: Uyghurs, Avars, Oghusen, Khazars, Bulgarians, Sabirs.

But who were the Khazar Turks? The Khazar Turks are expressly mentioned in Chinese sources.

In Jiu Tang Shu(舊唐書) describes a tribe of the Turks in the north of Sarmarkand (康國) with the name Kesa (突厥之可薩部)[12] .

In a work published in 1317 titled Wen Hsien Tung Kao (文獻 通考) by Ma Duanlin (馬端臨)[13] we find an entry about the Turkish Khazars in chapter 339:

“The Wai-kuo-t'u [map of foreign countries] says: From Yung-chên north there is a country called Ta-tsin. These people are of great size; they measure five or six chih in height 1. The Kuei-huan-hsing-ching-chi says: The Fu-lin country is in the west of Chan [old sound: Sham], separated by hills several thousand li; it is also called Ta-tsin. Its inhabitants have red and white faces. Men wear plain clothes, but women wear silk stuffs beset with pearls. They have many clever weavers of silk. Prisoners are kept in the frontier states till death without their being brought back to their home. In the manufacture of glass they are not equaled by any nation of the world. The royal city is eighty li square; the country in all directions measures several thousand li. Their army consists of about a million men. They have constantly to provide against the Ta-shih [Arabs]. On the west the country bounds on the western sea; on the south, on the southern sea; in the north it connects with Ko-sa Tu-chüeh [the Khozar Turks].[14]"

Byzantium is here referred to as Ta-tsin. The Kesa Tujue (可薩突厥) live in the north of Byzantium , which was the central territory of Khazaria at that time.

2.1 Turks are descendants of the Xiongnus

The Chinese sources leave no doubt about the origin of the Turks, called Tujue (突厥) in Chinese: They are a sub-group of the Xiongnus people. In Zhou Shu (周書), book 50, chapter Tujue (突厥), written in 636, it says :

"Tujue (突厥) is a subgroup (別種) of Xiongnu (匈奴) and had the family name Ashina (阿史那氏). They formed their own clan (部落). After a defeat against a neighboring country, the whole tribe disappeared. Only one child survived 10 years after a soldier did not have the heart to kill him, he simply cut off his hands

and feet and threw him into a bush sexually with the wolf and impregnated the wolf. The king of the neighboring country finally found out that the boy was still alive and sent a lion, which killed the boy. The lion saw the wolf and wanted to kill her too. The wolf fled into the im Mountains lying north of Gaochang State (高昌國, now Kocho in Xinjiang). There was a large cave in which there was a large open space with a lot of green. The area was several hundred li and the place was protected in all four directions d through mountains. This is where the she-wolf hid and finally gave birth to 10 cubs. These 10 boys grew up and acquired women from outside and made them pregnant. The descendants each received their own family name, including the name Ashina. The descendants became numerous and reached several hundred houses. After a few generations they came out of the cave and became subjects of the Rurus (茹茹). They lived in the south of the Gold Mountain (金山, Altai) and became metal smiths of the Rurus (茹茹)."[15]

The similarity between this legend and the story of King Joseph is remarkable. The latter does not, of course, say that the Khazars were descendants of a she-wolf.

But Tujue is not the only ethnic group known as Turks. In addition to Tujue, there were other ethnic groups who also spoke Turkish and whose popular name contained the etymon "Turk" or something similar. These are the peoples Dilli, Dingling, Chile, Tiele etc..

From this point of view, the breadth and meaning of the word "Turk" can be derived. After the destruction of the Xiongnu state, surviving and scattered Xiongnus, due to their independent organizational form ("worm mentality" = the Rurus), developed into strong warrior groups while calling themselves as the “Turks”.

For example, consider the Tiele (敕勒) people as enumerated in Sui Shu. Their habitat stretched from Asia Minor to Mongolia, they lived scattered and in small

groups of some 10,000 people. They were referred to as Tiele in Chinese history books like Sui Shu, but they did not live in an organizational unit, nor did they have any aspiration to do so. On the contrary: they will later fight each other to the death. But they saw themselves as one people, namely as the people of the Tiele = Tujue = Turks.

Sui Shu, Book 68, Tiele (敕 勒) lists more than 100 such groups, each of which had its own (family or tribal) name.

2.2 Turk = derekh דרך

From here the meaning of the word "Turk" can be deciphered. It is a self-designation of the Turkish speaking Xiongnus, who had different names because the surrounding peoples called them differently in their respective language (Dilli, Dingling, Chile, Tiele etc.). Why did the Turks call themselves "Turks"? Apparently the word "Türk" had an identity-creating function and meaning.

Based on an article written by Victor Mair, the Hebrew word “derekh בדרך“ is propoesed as an equivalent for the word "Türk". Victor Mair states that the Hebrew word “derekh” (דרך way) is deeply anchored both phonetically and semantically in many Asian cultures. He writes:

"One of the most interesting words I encountered in my researches is Manchu doro which has the full range of meaning that tao (-lu) does in Sinitic:" [correct] way, cosmic principle, ceremony, "etc. Indeed, doro was used as an extremely precise translation of Tao in Sino-Manchu texts. Conversely, doro was treated as a native Manchu word by Chinese scholars and its two syllables were transcribed into Sinitic with tetragraphs used for their sound rather than for their meaning. The usages of the two words doro and to (-lu) are so uncannily identical that one is tempted to believe they have a common source, for neither is considered to be a borrowing of the other. Since both words are very old in their respective languages, their presumed common ancestor must be more ancient than the language farmlies in which they are embedded. Manchu doro, incidentally, is identical with the word for "way" in Jurchen and is echoed by rergheghur ("road") in Mongolian, sister Altaic languages. The ancient sound of Tao in its fuller form

immediately calls to mind Hebrew derekh ("way, path, principle"), Arabic drugs or duriig '("to go, walk, follow a course") and tariq ("a religious philosophical method"), Akkadian daraggu ("path"), and Jibbiili darag ("tobecome used to walking"). Could it be just a mere coincidence that these words in Sinitic and Semitic both sound alike and share virtually the same range of meaning?"[16]

"Finding the right way and not losing it again" is one of the main themes of the Old Testament. One only needs to remember Psalm 119, 25 ff .:

"My soul sticks to the dust; give life to me according to your word! I have told my ways, and you have answered me; teach me your instructions! Let me understand the path that your commands show, and I will speak of your miracles. Mine Soul weeps with sorrow; rise me up according to your word; keep the way of lies far from me, and pardon me with your law; I have chosen the way of faithfulness, and set your ordinances before me; I hold fast to your testimonies; Lord, do not let me be put to shame! I walk the way of your commandments, for you make room for my heart. "

In a memorial inscription for the Gök-Turk leader Bilge Khan (毗伽可汗, died 734) the word "Turk" is used in this sense: Turk is the correct, i.e. divine way:

"Nevertheless the younger brothers were not created as their grandfathers,

Neither were their sons concerning their fathers.

They didn't happen to be wise qagans.

They were not brave rulers.

Their executors were the same as their qagans.

The noble men and people were not staunch.

Thus, the Chinese became imprudent,

Acting energetically and cheating, as a consequence,

The relative occurred to be at enmity with each other,

The noble men split from people.

The whole Turkic people dispersed, lost its supremacy.

Qayans who had formed the community were destroyed.

The noble lads and beautiful girls became slaves to the Chinese.

Turkic noble men forgetting their Turkic names,

Becoming Chinese like rulers, taking Chinese names,

(Turkic) noble men was subordinated to Chinese emperor,

For fifty years having served for China.

They waged wars up to Bokuli qagan on the east.

And up to Temir Qapig on the west.

Chinese emperor ruled their people, supremacy.

And then the Turkic people appeared to appeal:

“We were the masters of our country.

Where does it exist now?

Who is to rule our people?

We were the people ruled by qagan.

Where is our qagan?

What qagan shall I work and serve for?

Thus, the people became Chinese emperor's enemy.

Becoming enemy, opposed to him.

And it had to subordinate again, it grew vanishing.

The people didn't realize they were too careless.

The Turkic people were exhausted, became vanished, without offsprings.

Then the Turkic Heavens and Land said:

"Let all Turkic people live". " [17]

This is an excerpt from the stone monument for Bilge Khagan, whose deeds and life's work as the Khagan of the second Eastern Empire of the Gök-Turks are described in Old Turkish script. This stone monument was found in Mongolia, in the Maantyn Burd district (N 46º20´, E 102º11´).

Indeed, the history of the Gök-Turk States (552-744) was mainly to try to break free from the clutches of the Tang Dynasty because the latter had gone the incorrect way, which meant that the Tangs, formerly also Israelite people (Yi 夷), now completely lost, because they had adopted customs and religions of the (Han) Chinese.

But the Gök Turks were unsuccessful and had to leave China. For example, 120,000 Eastern Gök Turks lost their lives against 100,000-men Tang army at the Battle of Yingshan in southern Mongolia in 630, which led to the fall of the Eastern Gök Turkish Empire. The Tang Emperor Taizong adorned himself with the title "Tian Kehan = Heavenly Khan".

The Western Gök Turkish Empire also went down due to a defeat against Tang in Dzungaria in 657.

If one accepts the etymological origin of the word "Türk" as the Hebrew word “derekh”, it makes sense to look for the etymological origin for the word "Kazar", "Kosa", "Kesa" in Hebrew as well. Here the word chasak (חזק, Strength) comes into mind. Biblical names based on this word are Hezekiel (יְחֶזְקֵאל, Yəḥezqēl, "God strengthens") and Hezekiah (חִזְקִיָּהוּ, "Yehovah strengthens").

So the ancestors of the Khazars were the Gök Turks. They "fled the yoke of idol worshipers," which was a fitting phrase for the Tang Chinese; for Tang China experienced the heyday of Buddhism at this time; Buddha statues flooded the land. As descendants of the Xiongnus, the Turks proudly presented themselves as the advocates of the right path (Türk, derekh) by calling themselves as Türk, Tiele, Dingling etc.. By displaying this identity they wanted to deliberately differentiate themselves from their renegade tribal relatives in China which the

Sui and Tang Dynasties were. They did not want to mix with the Chinese (Babylonian-Egyptian = Children of Ham) culture. They preferred to flee from China. For them, the (Tang) Chinese were idol worshipers who had left the right path.

3 The Arrival of the Khazars in Dagestan according to Jiu Tang Shu (舊唐書) and Sui Shu (隋書)

So the Khazars arrived in what is now Dagestan. The question here is when this happened and who were inhabiting this territory at the time of their arrival. The passage in the text who received the Khazars could not be deciphered in the manuscript. Schechter added the following passage into the gap:

"And [the princes of Khazaria] received them."

This makes little sense, the princes of the Khazars cannot receive themselves. King Joseph gives a clearer answer to this question:

"The land in which I now live was formerly occupied by the Bulgarians. Our ancestors, the Chazars, came and fought with them, and, although these Bulgarians were as numerous as the sand on the shores of the sea, they could not withstand the Chazars. So they left their country and fled while the Chazars pursued them as far as the Danube River. Up to this very day the Bulgars camp along the Danube and are close to Constantinople. The Chazars have occupied their land up till now. "

The arriving Khazars drove out the Bulgarians who, according to their own statements, were tribal relatives of the Khzars.

"I have found in the genealogical books of my ancestors that Togarmah had ten sons. These are their names: the eldest was Ujur, the second Tauris, the third Avar, the fourth Uguz, the fifth Bizal, the sixth Tarna, the seventh Chazar , the eighth Janur, the ninth Bulgar, the tenth Sawir. "

But that does not answer the question of who received the Khazars. If the Bulgarians had received them, the Khazars would not had to fight against and drive them out. Apparently the Bulgarians ruled over another people who at that time inhabited the territory.

According to Jiu Tang Shu (舊唐書), the conquest of today's Dagestan and the surrounding area by the Gök Turks took place under Tong Yabghu Kaghan (統葉護可汗). This invasion happened as follows:

"Tong Yabghu Kaghan is a courageous and strategically versed man. He conquered Tiele (鐵勒), opposed the Persians (波斯) in the west , and in the south he incorporated all peoples up to Kashmir (罽 賓) into his empire. Commanded 10,000,000 mounted arrows and established his power in the Western Region, he occupied the land of the Wusuns and even pitched his tent in Qianquan (千 泉), north of Shiguo (石 國). All the princes of the Western Region took the Turkish title Jielifa (頡 利 發). Tong Yabghu Kaghan then sent a Tutun (吐 屯) to oversee all. The power of the Western Turks had never before reached such abundance. "[18]

Tong Yabghu Qaghan (統 葉 護 可汗) was the fourth Khagan of the Western Gök-Turk Empire and ruled from 618 to 628. Theophanes the Confessor mentions a "Khagan of the Khazars named "Ziebel", who ruled the Byzantine Empire in the war against Sassanid Persians in 627[19] . Since 627 falls during the reign of Tong Yabghu Qaghan as the Khagan of the Gök Turks, Ziebel could actually have been Tong Yabghu Qaghan, but this is not strictly proven. There are quite a few historians who are of the opinion that the rulers was Shebe (設卑) Khagan, an uncle of Tong Yabghu Qaghan, the latter's murderer. This Shebe could be the founder of Khazaria[20].

During this time, according to Sui Shu (隋書), various Tiele tribes lived in the east and west of the Caspian Sea:

"In the east and west of Deyihai (得 嶷 海, Caspian Sea), there were Sulujie (蘇路羯), Sansuoyan (三 索咽), Miecu (蔑促), Longhu (隆忽) and so on, more than 8,000 men."[21]

These groups of people were those who received the Khazars. They had allied themselves with the Khazars to drive out the Bulgarians from their homeland. This is the only way to explain that Khazaria had residents who were not Khazars from the outset, as can be seen from the following. This passage describes how the Khazars had come to terms with the local Tiele population. This passage becomes clearer if the Schechter inserts are removed.

"3 - Khazaria were first without Torah. And [..] remained without inhabitants of the land [..]

4 - Torah and Scriptures and made marriage with the inhabitants of the land [..]

5- And they learned their deeds and went out with them

[..]

6 - And they became [..] people. Only upon the covenant of circumcision they relied. And [..]

7 - observed the Sabbath. "

This passage could read like this:

3 - Khazaria were first without Torah. And remained without [it as the] inhabitants of the land.

4— [But the Khazars had the] Torah and Scriptures and made marriage with the inhabitants of the land

5 — And they learned their deeds and went out with them [to wars.]

6 — And they became [one] people. Only upon the covenant of circumcision they relied. And

7 — observed the Sabbath. "

This passage should therefore be understood in this way: The original inhabitants of Khazaria, the Tieles, did not have the Torah, the newcomers, the Khazars, had the Torah, yet the Kharzars married the Tieles and adopted their customs and went to war with them. And they became one people. They only kept the commandment of circumcision together and observed the Sabbat.

The intermingling with the Tiele tribes was possible because the Tiele were Israelites, too. Although they had no Torah anymore and therefore had only a vague idea of Israelitism, but they at least kept the commandments of circumcision and Sabbath. But the Khazars, too, did not read the Torah because they could not decipher and understand it (any more), as we will see below.

4. The Repentance of the Khazars

From line 13 on the author describes how the Khazars became Jews.

“13- until the Lord had mercy and awakened the heart of the prince to do repentance.

14 -For his wife, whose name was Sarah, turned him and taught him profitably. And hey then

15- consented, for he was circumcised. But also the father of the young woman, a righteous man in that generation,

16 - taught him the way of life. "

The name of this prince is disclosed in King Joseph's letter:

"After this, several generations passed until a certain King arose whose name was Bulan. He was a wise and God-fearing man, trusting in his Creator with all his heart. He expelled the wizards and idolators from the land and took refuge in the shadow of His wings. "

The phrase: "[He] took refuge in the shadow of His wings." Is taken from Psalm 91: 4:

"He will cover you with his wings, and under his wings you will hide yourself; his faithfulness is a shield and a shield."

The title "prince" probably refers to the chief of a Turkish state, the Chanyu. He found the biblical faith because of his wife and father-in-law. The latters showed him the righteous way (derekh). The "conversion" of the Khazars to Judaism began with the Chanyu, without any involvement of the rabbinical Jews from Baghdad. Apparently his wife and her father were Israelites who still knew the old faith. The Chanyu was even circumcised.

4.1 The Competition of Religions

Following line 16 is the description of the famous competition between the three world religions, Christianity, Islam and Judaism, to win the favor of the Khazars.

“16 - And it came to pass that when the kings of Macedon

17 - and the kings of Arabia heard of these things, they waxed exceeding wroth. And they sent

18 - messengers to the princes of Khazaria with words of blasphemy against Israel, saying:

19 - “What mean ye by returning to the belief of the Jews who are subject under

20 - the hands of all the nations? " And they spake words which are not for us to tell. And they turned the

21- heart of the princes to evil. Then said the great prince, the Jew: “To what end,

22 - increase words? Let there come (men) of the wise men of Israel and of the wise men of Greece,

23 - and of the wise men of Arabia. And let everyone of them tell before us and before you.

24 - [the work of his God and we shall see] the end. " And they did so and he sent

25- [messengers to the kings of Greece] and to the kings of Arabia. But the wise men of Israel also offered themselves

26 - [to come to the aid of the men of] Khazaria. There upon the Greeks opened with their testimony

27- . . . . . .and the Jews and the Arabians began to contradict them. And after this

28- [the Arabians bore witness] and the jews and the Greeks contradicted them. And then opened

29- [the wise men of Israel their testimony] telling from the days of the creation, until the day when the children of Israel came up

30- from Egypt, and until they arrived at an inhabited country. (To the truth of this), the Greeks

31- as well as the Arabians bore witness and confirmed it, but there arose also dissension amongst them. "

4.2 The Judges - the Greats of Khazaria

In this contest, the “princes” were the judges. The Chanyu was already on the side of the Jews, he could not be a judge. The princes were enticed by the blasphemy

of the Greeks and Arabs: "And they turned the heart of the princes to evil." But who were these princes?

These were the nobles of Khazaria. As known from the Xiongnus, the members of the royal family held the highest offices in the state. Without the support of these nobles, the Chanyu and the Jewish general could not run the state. So the "Contest of Religions" was about winning the hearts of the Khazarian nobles.

It is the Jewish general who proposes this competition, the outcome of which he probably knew in advance. He and the Chanyu were already on the right path, that is, they had the Jewish faith already.

4.3 Course of the Competition in the Letter of King Joseph

In King Joseph's letter, the competition is described a little bit differently:

"On the third day he called all the sages together and said to them:

"Speak and argue with one another and make clear to me which is the best religion." They began to dispute with one another without arriving at any results until the King said to the Christian priest:

"What do you think? Of the religion of the Jews and the Muslims which is to be preferred?" The priest answered: "The religion of the Israelites is better than that of the Muslims."

The King then asked the kadi [a Muslim judge and scholar]: "What do you say? Is the religion of the Israelites, or that of the Christians preferable?" The kadi answered: "The religion of the Israelites is preferable."

Upon this the King said: "If this is so, you both have admitted with your own mouths that the religion of the Israelites is better. Wherefore, trusting in the mercies of God and the power of the

Almighty, I choose the religion of Israel, that is, the religion of Abraham."

Here the logic of objective reasoning wins ("What is the second best solution?"), and the decision is made by the Chanyu.

4.4 Judgement by the Torah

In the Schechter Letter the contest was decided through the Torah:

"32- Then said the princes of Khazaria,"Behold, there is a cave in the valley of Tizul. Bring forth for us

33- the books which are there and explain them to us. "And they did so and went

34- into the cave. And behold, there were there Books of the Law of Moses, and the wise men of Israel explained them

35- in accordance with the words which they spake first."

The rending of proof is here more decisive. The Khazars noble were convinced because the rabbi was able to prove that what he taught was already recorded in the Holy Book of the Khazars, in the Torah. That the Khazars owned the Bible was probably a well-known fact among the Khazars: The nobles of Khazaria caused the Bible be brought from a cave.

Such a “Sacred Book” is also mentioned in Wei Shu for Kang Guo State (Sarmakand):

“They have a Hu code of law that they keep in a temple and that they take out whenever a case arises that requires judgment on punishments, and they judge by that book. In the worst case, the entire clan is killed, thereafter comes the death penalty, in case of theft the legs are amputated."[22]

The Israelite peoples therefore always had the Torah with them; however, the Khazars were no longer able to read or understand them. This is what the rabbinical Jews did for them; the Khazars had now an eye-opening experience, described in Line 36:

"Then Israel, together with the men of Khazaria, returned in perfect repentance."

Here the question arises: What or who is meant here by "Israel"? The Khazarians are not, for they are mentioned by the following passage. The rabbinical Jews are not either, because they do not need to repent, they are already on the right path. Only the original inhabitants of Dagestan remain, the Tiele people, who had allied themselves with the Khazars. Now the author calls them"Israelites", which is in fact true. They had emigrated to China more than 1,000 years ago from exile in Babylon by ships via India. Now everyone realized that they, the Khazarian nobles and rabbinical Jews, worshiped the One and the same God, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Hence, they undertook the perfect repentance, which is here expressed with the Hebrew word "shub שׁוּב". It is not a conversion, but repentance in the sense of Deuteronomy 30, 1:

"But it will happen when all these words come upon you, the blessing and the curse that I have set before you, and you take it to your heart among all the heathen peoples among whom the LORD your God has cast you away If you turn back to the LORD your God and obey his voice in all that I command you this day, you and your children with all your heart and with all your soul, the LORD your God will turn your fate around and have mercy on you and will gather you again from all the peoples where the LORD your God has scattered you. "

This repentance was also possible because the Chinese Israelites had kept the highest commandment of the Bible: Never to give the Torah out of hand.

According to King Joseph's letter it is Bulan's son, King Obadiah (reigned from 786 to 809) who introduced rabbinic Judaism into Khazaria.

"After the days of Bulan there arose one of his descendants, a king, Obadiah by name, who reorganized the kingdom and established the Jewish religion properly and correctly. He built synagogues and schools, brought in Jewish scholars, and rewarded them with gold and silver. They explained to him the Bible, Mishnah, Talmud, and the order of divine services. The King was a man who revered and loved the Torah. He was one of the true servants of God. "

The Arab historian Ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadānī confirms this process in a book dating to 1010:

"And they (the Khazars) took on the difficult obligations imposed by the law of the Torah, such as circumcision, ritual ablutions, ablution after the shedding of (male) semen, the prohibition of labor on the Sabbath and during the feast days , the prohibition of (consumption of the meat of) animals that are (prohibited) according to this religion, and so on."[23]

That is probably the birth of Orthodox Judaism as we know it today.

The author of the Schechter Letter then tries to establish the tribal identity of the Khazars and postulates that the Khazars belong to the tribe of Simeon, and immediately has doubts about it.

“42 - Now they say in our land

43 -that our ancestors came from the tribe of Simeon, but we are not able to probe

44 - the truth of the matter. "

In fact, they were not descended from Simeon alone. Turks were an amalgamation of many Israelite tribes. In Jiu Tang Shu, Turks are called the 9 Tribes Tujue (九姓 突厥). Similar to 9-Yi Tribes (九夷族) as known in Confucius’ time, this phrase refers to the "lost 9 tribes of Israel".

The Khazars comprised of (at least) the 9 tribes of Samaria. Probably all 12 Tribes of Israel were included.

Further reading:

Dr. Howard HS Chung, Dispersion of the Israelites in the Eurasian Continent: How GOD has fulfilled His Promise: History of Eurasia from Biblical Perspective, 2023, https://www.amazon.com/dp/B0CCXP3FKX.

Notes:

[1] Quoted from Zuckerman, C., On the Date of the Khazars ʻConversion to Judaism, p. 246.

[2] Marcus, Jacob, R., The Jew in the Medieval World: A Sourcebook, 315-1791, Cincinnati , 1938, p. 228.

[3] Cf. Róna-Tas, András, Hungarians & Europe in the Early Middle Ages: An Introduction to Early Hungarian History, New York, 1999 , p. 282 .

[4] Schechter, Solomon, An unknown Khazar document, in: The Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. 3, No. 2 (Oct. 1912), 181-219.

[5] Reprinted in Marcus, Jacob, R., The Jew in the Medieval World: A Sourcebook, 315-1791, Cincinnati, 1938, pp. 228 ff.

[6] What was meant was the custom of the Xiongnus to raise merited warriors to the rank of general, even if they did not belong to their own people. This was evidently a Jew who - as can be seen from lines 37 ff. - came from Baghdad, Khorasan or Byzantium. There is no doubt that the Jews in exile lived scattered in this area.

[7] Khagan therefore means "judge" for the Khazars, in Hebrew "shaphat "". Behind the title Khan there is the office of judge in the biblical sense. Genghis Khan is the" great judge "of the Mongols.

[8] This is Aaron II, who became king of Khazaria in 927. The mercenaries referred to here as Turks were Oghuzen, with whose help the Kazharians fought against the Alans.

[9] This is Romanus IV Diogenes (from 1068 to 1071 Emperor of Byzantium).

[10] It is Oleg, called "the Prophet" (Cyrillic Олег; altostslawisch Ольгъ; altnordisch Helgi; † 912 or 922). Oleg is considered to be the founder of the Kiev Rus.

[11] In the 960s, Svyatoslav, with the help of the Pechenegs, finally succeeded in breaking the power of the Khazar Empire. The Khazarian fortresses of Sarkel and Tamatarcha fell to the Rus in 965, followed by the capital Itil in 967 or 969.

[12] Jiu Tang Shu 舊 唐, Book 198,西戎.

[13] Ma Duanlin (馬 端 臨), Wen Hsien Tung Kao (文獻 通考), chapter 339; the text translated by Hirth, Friedrich, China and the Roman Orient, Researches into their Ancient and Medieval Relations as Represented in Old Chinese Records, Shanghai & Hong Kong, 1885.

[14] In the translation by Hirth, Friedrich, China and the Roman Orient, pp. 71 f ..

[15]突厥 者,蓋 匈奴 之 別 種,姓 阿 史 那 氏.別 爲 部落.後 爲 鄰國 所 破,盡滅 其 族.有 一 兒,年 且 十歲,兵 人 見其 小,不忍 殺 之,乃 刖 其 足,棄 草澤 中.有 牝 狼 以 肉 飼 之,及

長,與 狼 合,遂 有孕 焉.彼王 聞 此 兒 尙 在,重 遣 殺 之.使者 見 狼 在 側,並欲殺 狼.狼 遂 逃 于 高昌 國 之 北山.山 有 洞穴,穴內 有 平壤 茂草,周 回 數百 里,四面 俱 山.狼 匿 其中,遂 生 十 男.十 男 長大,外 託 妻 孕,其後 各有 一 姓,阿 史 那 卽 一 也.子孫 蕃 育,漸 至 數百 家.經 數 世,相與 出 穴,臣 於 茹茹.居 金山 之 陽,爲 茹茹 鐵工.金山形似 兜鍪,其 俗 謂 兜鍪爲「突厥」,遂 因 以爲 號 焉. Zhou Shu (周 書) , Book 50,突厥.

[16] Mair, Victor H., Tracks of the Tao, Semantics of Zen, Sino-Platonic Papers No. 23, 1991, p. 4.

[17] From the website of the Language Committee of the Ministry of Culture and Information of the Republic of Kazakhstan, http://bitig.org.

[18]統 葉 護 可汗,勇 而 有 謀,善 攻戰.遂 北**并** 鐵勒,西 拒 波斯,南 接 罽 賓,悉 歸 之,控 弦 數 十萬,霸 有 西域,據 舊 烏孫 之 地.又 移 庭 於 石 國 北 之 千 泉.其 西域 諸 國王 悉 授 頡 利 發,**并** 遣 吐 屯 一 人 監 統 之,督 其 征 賦.西戎 之 盛,未 之 有 也. Jiu Tang Shu 舊 唐 書, Book 1 94, 突厥.

[19] Cf. Golden, Introduction, p. 135; Christian, p. 260.

[20] Cf. La Vaissière, E. de "Oncles et frères : les qaghans Ashinas et le vocabulaire turc de la parenté", Turcica 42, 2010, pp. 267-27.

[21] Cheng Fangyi, The research on the identification between Tiele and the Ogoric Tribes, 2012.

[22]有 胡 律,置於 祆 祠,將 決 罰,則 取 而 斷 之.重 者 族,次 罪 者 死,賊盜 截 其 足. Wei Shu (魏書), Book 102, Western Regions, Kanggguo (西域,康 國).

[23] Quoted in Brook, The Jews of Khazaria 94-95.

Literature

Alemany , Agusti , Sources on the Alans: A Critical Compilation, Leiden u.a., 2000.

Altheim, Franz, Hunnische Runen, Halle (Saale), 1948.

Alstola, Tero, Judeans in Babylonia A Study of Deportees in the Sixth and Fifth Centuries BCE, Universität Helsinki, 2018.

Amira, Karl, Grundriss des germanischen Rechts, 3. Aufl., Strassburg, 1913.
(Vol. 1-2)

Anke, Bodo, Studien zur reiternomadischen Kultur des 4. bis 5. Jahrhunderts, Weissbach, 1998.

An Chung Bok (安鼎福), Abhandlung über die Geschichte des Osten (東史綱目), 1791,

Korean Classical Literature Database (한국고전종합 DB), 東史綱目,

http://db.itkc.or.kr/dir/item?itemId=BT#dir/node?grpId=&itemId=BT&gubun=book&depth=2&cate1=C&cate2=&dataGubun=%EC%84%9C%EC%A7%80&dataId=ITKC_BT_1366A.

The Annals of the Joseon Dynasty (朝鮮王朝實錄, 조선왕조실록),
http://sillok.history.go.kr/main/main.do

Aradi Eva, The Yue-chis, Kushans and Hephtalites, in: Journal of Eurasian Studies, Volume II, Issue 2, 2010, S. 45.

Ball, Charles James, Chinese and Sumerian, London, 1913.

Barbieri-Low, Anthony J., Wheeled Vehicles in the Chinese Bronze Age (c. 2000–741 B.C.), Sino-Platonic Papers, Number 99, 2000.

Bârcă, Vitalie, A few notes on the tamgas from the golden plaque in the Sarmatian grave at Dunaharaszti (Hungary), Journal of Ancient History and Archaeology, 5/4, 2018, 41-65.

Bei Shi 北史, Chinese Notes, http://chinesenotes.com/beishi.html.

Beit-Arie, Malachi (Herausgeber, Worms Mahzor, MS Jewish National and University Library, Heb 4° 78/1, London, 1985.

Bopearachchi, Osmund, Greeks, Scythians, Parthians and Kushans in Central Asia and India, in: Eurasian Empires in Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages Contact and Exchange between the Graeco-Roman World, Inner Asia and China, 2017, S. 266.

Brook, Kevin Alan, The Jews of Khazaria, 2. Edition, New York, Toronto, Oxford, 2006.

Chunqiu Zuozhuan 春秋左傳, Frühling-und-Herbst-(Chronik) in der Überlieferung des Zuo, Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/chun-qiu-zuo-zhuan.

Das R., Wexler P., Pirooznia M., Elhaik E, Localizing Ashkenazic Jews to Primeval Villages in the Ancient Iranian Lands of Ashkenaz, Genome Biol Evol., 2016 Apr 19, 1132-49.

Demsky, Aaron, in: Studies **in** Jewish Onomastics, Vol. 4, Some Reflections on the Names of the Jews of Kaifeng, China, 2003.

De Lacouperie, Terrien

The Old Babylonian Characters and their Chinese Derivates, London, 1888.

Catalogue of Chinese Coins from the Vllth Century B.C. to A.D. 621, including the series in the British Museum, 1892.

Western Origin of the Early Chinese Civilisation, London, 1894.

Erya 爾雅, Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/er-ya.

Eraly, Abraham,*The First Spring: The Golden Age of India,* 2011.

Euagrios Scholastiscos, Historia Ekklesiastike, translated by E. Walford, London, 1846.

Fabricius, B. (Hrsg.), Der Periplus des Erythräischen Meeres von einem Unbekannten, 1883.

Förstemann, Ernst, Altdeutsches Namenbuch. Erster Band. Personennamen, 2. A., 1900.

Frähn, Christian Martin, Ibn Foszlan's und anderer Araber Berichte über die Russen älterer Zeit, St. Petersburg, 1823.

Fredegar, Die Chronik Fredegars und der Frankenkönige, die Lebensbeschreibungen des Abtes Columban, der Bischöfe Arnulf, Leodegar und Eligius, der Königin Balthilde, übersetzt von Otto Abel, 3. Aufl. Leibzig, 1888.

Bruno Krusch (Hrsg.), Fredegarii et Aliorum Chronica, Vitae Sanctorum, Hannover, 1988.

Fritz, Sonja, Die Ossetischen Personennamen, Wien 1983/2005.

Fu Fa Zang Yin Yuan Chuan, 付法藏因緣傳, Taibei Shi : Jiu pin ban yin jing fang, Minguo 86, 1997.

Gayibov, Bobir, About To the Question of the Main Origin of Sogdian Rulers, in: International Journal of Humanities & Social Science Studies, *Volume-III, Issue-I, July 2016, S. 235-242.*

Gierke, Otto von, Der germanische Staatsgedanke, Berlin, 1919.

Göbl, Robert, Dokumente zur Geschichte der iranischen Hunnen, Wiesbaden, 1967.

Golden, Peter B., Khazar Studies: Achievements and Perspectives, in: Golden, Peter B.; Ben-Shammai, Haggai; Róna-Tas, András (eds.), The World of the Khazars: New Perspectives. Handbook of Oriental Studies, Leiden, Boston, 2007.

Golden, Peter B. Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples. Wiesbaden, 1992.

Gordon, Colin, The Age of Attila. Fifth-Century Byzantium and the Barbarians, Toronto, 1960.

Gregor von Tours, Historien, Kirchliche Geschichte der Franken in zehn Büchern, Würzburg 1853.

Grimme, Holger (Übersetzer), Buch Jaschar, Wellenfels, 2006.

Guanzi 管子, Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/guanzi.

Han Chiyun (韓致奫), Geschichte des Ostens(海東繹史), 1814, Korean Classical Literature Database (한국고전종합 DB), 海東繹史, http://db.itkc.or.kr/dir/item?itemId=BT#dir/node?grpId=&itemId=BT&gubun=book&depth=2&cate1=N&cate2=&dataGubun=%EC%84%9C%EC%A7%80&dataId=ITKC_BT_1433A.

Han Shu 漢書, Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/han-shu.

Harmatta, János, Studies in the History and Language of the Sarmartians, 1970.

Hartner, Willy: Die Goldhörner von Gallehus, Wiesbaden, 1969.

Hirth, Friedrich,

China and the Roman Orient, Researches into their Ancient and Medieval Relations as Represented in Old Chinese Records, Shanghai & Hong Kong, 1885.

Hou Han Shu 後漢書, Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/hou-han-shu.

Ho, Dahpon David, Fujian and the Making of a Maritime Frontier in Seventeenth-Century China, University of California, Dissertation, 2011.

Holzinger, Michael (Hrsg.), Konfuzius: Gespräche, Berlin 2013.

Hsu, Cho-yun, The Spring and Autumn Period, in: Loewe, Shaughnessy, The Cambridge history of ancient China: from the origins of civilization to 221 BC, 1990, Ss. 545–86.

Intrater, Asher, Who Ate Lunch with Abraham? - A Study of the Appearances of God in the Form of a Man in the Hebrew Scriptures, 2011.

Istvánovits, Eszter, Valéria Kulcsár, Sarmatians- History and Archaeology of a Forgotten People, Mainz, 2017.

Jin Shi (金史), https://zh.wikisource.org/wiki/%E9%87%91%E5%8F%B2.

Jin Shu **晉書,** Chinese Notes, http://chinesenotes.com/jinshu.html.

Jiu Tang Shu 舊唐書, Chinese Notes, http://chinesenotes.com/jiutangshu.html.

Kang, D.H. and Nelson, Ethel R, The Discovery of Genesis – How the Truth of Genesis were Found Hidden in the Chinese Language, Saint Louis, 1979.

Kalt, Markus, Die Ungarische Bilderchronik, Berlin, 1961.

Kaulis, Andis, Stars, Stones and Scholars – The Decipherment of the Megaliths, St. Victoria, 2003.

Kao Li Shi (高麗史고려사), Korean History Database, (한국사데이터베이스), http://db.history.go.kr/KOREA/item/level.do?itemId=kr&types=r.

Kim, Hyun Jin, The Huns, Rome and the Birth of Europe, Cambridge, 2013.

Kim, Hyun Jin, Frederik Juliaan Vervaet ,Selim Ferruh Adal, Hrsg., Eurasian Empires in Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, Cambridge, 2017.

Knapp, Keith Nathaniel, The Meaning of Birds on Hunping (Spirit Jars): The Religious Imagination of Second to Fourth Century Jiangnan, in: Asian Studies, 7(2), 2019, 153-172.

Kozlovskaya, Valeriya and Sergey M. Ilyashenko, Tamgas and tamga-like signs from Tanais, in: Zeichentragende Artefakte im sakralen Raum, Berlin u.a., 2018.

Kurbanov, Aydigdy , The Hephthalites: Archaeological and Historical Analysis, Dissertation, Berlin, 2010.

Kusternig, Andreas, Hermann Haupt: Quellen zur Geschichte des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts. = Fontes historiam saeculorum septimi et octavi illustrantes (= Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters. 4a). Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 1982.

Kuwayama, The Hephthalites in Tokharistan and Gandhara, in: Across the Hindukush of the First Millennium: a collection of the papers, Kyoto, 2002.

La Vaissière, E. de "Oncles et frères : les qaghans Ashinas et le vocabulaire turc de la parenté", in: Turcica 42, 2010, SS. 267–327.

Laozi (老子), Dao De Jing (道德經), Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/dao-de-jing.

Lightle, Steve, Operation Exodus II – Answers you need to know about explosive future events, Tulsa, 1998.

Lee Am (李嵒), Dangunsegi (檀君世記 단군세기), Übersetzung Chung, Hyuchul, Seoul, 2017.

Lee, Seung Hyu (李承休, 이승휴), Kaiser-König-Chronik (帝王韻紀, 제왕운기), 1287, Korean History Database, (한국사데이터베이스), http://db.history.go.kr/KOREA/item/level.do?itemId=mujw&types=r

Lee Sugang (李睟光), Jibiongyuseol (芝峰類設, 지봉유설), 1614, Korean Classical

Li, Hui, et al., Diversification of the ADH1B Gene during Expansion of Modern Humans. Annals of Human Genetics 75, 497–507, 2011.

Literature Database (한국고전종합 DB), 芝峰類設, http://db.itkc.or.kr/dir/item?itemId=GO#/dir/node?dataId=ITKC_GO_1304A&solrQ=opExt%E2%80%A0N$query%E2%80%A0%EC%A7%80%EB%B4%89%EC%9C%A0%EC%84%A4$solr_sortField%E2%80%A0$solr_sortOrder%E2%80%A0$solr_secId%E2%80%A0GO_AA$solr_toalCount%E2%80%A01$solr_curPos%E2%80%A00$solr_solrId%E2%80%A0SJ_ITKC_GO_1304A

Lu zuqian 呂祖謙, 東萊先生左氏博議集要, Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=en&res=546938.

Luo, Huai-Rong u.a., Origin and dispersal of atypical aldehyde dehydrogenase ALDH2*487Lys, Gene 435, S. 96–103, 2009.

Luyun (陸雲). Wikisource, https://zh.wikisource.org/zh-hant/寒蟬賦_(陸雲).

Lunyu 論語, Analects, English translation: James Legge, Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/analects.

Ma Duanlin (馬端臨), Wen Hsien Tung Kao (文獻通考), Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/library.pl?if=en&res=881&by_title=%E6%96%87%E7%8C%AE%E9%80%9A%E8%80%83.

Majumdar, Ramesh Chandra, Outline of ancient Indian History and Civilisation, Delhi, 1952.

Marcellinus, Ammianus, Res Gestae, Übersetzung von Büchele, Hamburg, 1964.

Marcellinus, Ammianus, Res Gestae, Aus dem Lateinischen übersetzt und mit erläuternden Anmerkungen begleitet von Johann Augustin Wagner, Frankfurt am Main, 1792.

Marco Polo, Die Wunder der Welt – die Reise nach China an den Hof des Kublai Khan, 7. Aufl., Berlin, 2016.

Marcus, Marcellinus, Ammianus, Res Gestae Jacob, R., The Jew in the Medieval World: A Sourcebook, 315-1791, Cincinnati, 1938.

Martens, Wilhelm, *Jordanes Gothengeschichte nebst Auszügen aus seiner Römischen Geschichte*, Leipzig, 1883.

Mair, Victor H., Tracks of the Tao, Semantics of Zen, Sino-Platonic Papers No. 23, 1991.

Mahajan, Vidya Dhar, A history of India, New Delhi, 2003.

Masefield, John, Travel of Marco Polo the Venetian, London, 1908.

Meller, Harald, Der spielende Fürst. Ein Brettspiel aus dem Grab 3 von Leuna. In: H. Meller (Hrsg.), Schönheit, Macht und Tod. 120 Funde aus 120 Jahren Landesmuseum für Vorgeschichte in Halle, Halle [Saale] 2001), 132–133.

Mukherjee, B. N., The Great Kushana Testament, Indian Museum Bulletin, Calcutta, 1995.

Nanshi, 南史, Chinese Notes, http://chinesenotes.com/nanshi/nanshi079.html.

Nan Qi Shu (南齊書), Wiki Source, https://zh.wikisource.org/zh-hant/南齊書.

Nielsen, Karen Høilund, Endzeiterwartung – expecting the End of the World, in: Dying Gods – Religious beliefs in northern and eastern Europe in the time of Christianisation, Stuttgart, 2015.

Noonan, Thomas S., The Economy of the Khazar Khaganate, in: Golden, Peter B.; Ben-Shammai, Haggai; Róna-Tas, András (eds.), The World of the Khazars: New Perspectives. Handbook of Oriental Studies, Leiden, Boston, 2007.

Obrusanszky, Borbála,
Late Huns in Caucasus, in: Journal of Eurasian Studies, Vol. I, Issue 2, 2009, S. 24.
State Structure of the Huns, in: Journal of Eurasian Studies, Vol. II, Issue 1, 2010, S. 55.

Osier MV, Pakstis AJ, Soodyall H, Comas D, Goldman D, Odunsi A, Okonofua F, Parnas J, Schulz LO, Bertranpetit J, Bonne-Tamir B, Lu RB, Kidd JR, Kidd KK, A global perspective on genetic variation at the ADH genes reveals unusual patterns of linkage disequilibrium and diversity, in: Americal Journal of Human Genetics, 71, S. 84-99, 2002.

Pellar, Brian R., On the Origins of the Alphabet, Sino-Platonic Papers 196, 2009.

Pesch, Alexandra, Fallstricke und Glatteis: Die germanische Tierornamentik, in: Altertumskunde – Altertumswissenschaft – Kulturwissenschaft: Erträge und Perspektiven nach 40 Jahren Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde, 2012, Berlin, Boston, (633–687).

Ptolemäus, Claudius: Tetrabiblos. Nach der von Philipp Melanchthon besorgten seltenen Ausgabe aus dem Jahre 1553. 3. Aufl., Tübingen, 2012.

Pritsak, Omeljan, The Hunnic Language of the Attila Clan, in: HARVARD UKRAINIAN STUDIES, Volume VI Number 4 December 1982, (428-276)

Prokopios of Caesarea, History of the Wars, and Secret History, Editor Henry B. Dewing and Glanville Downey, Cambridge, 1914–1940.

Pulleyblank, Edwin G., The peoples of the Steppe Frontier in early Chinese Sources, in: Migracijske teme 15, 1998, 35-61.

Quast, Dieter, Die Grabbeigaben – ein kommentierter Fundkatalog. In: Quast, Dieter (Hrsg.), Das Grab des fränkischen Königs Childerich in Tournai und die Anastasis Childerici von Jean-Jacques Chifflet aus dem Jahre 1655, Mainz, 2015, S. 165 ff..

Rashid ad-Din, Die China-Geschichte des Rashid-Ad-Din, übersetzt von Karl Jahn, Wien, 1971.

Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde, Berlin-New York, 2010.

Riddle, Mark A., Tenn ō (天皇): The Central Asian Origin of Japan's Solar Kingship, Sino-Platonic Papers, 214, 2011.

Rießler, Paul, Altjüdisches Schrifttum außerhalb der Bibel, Augsburg, 1928.

Rogozhinskii, Alexei E., Sergey A. Yatsenko, The Ancient Tamga-Signs of Southeast Kazakhstan and Their Owners: The Route from East to West in the 2nd Century BCE – 2nd Century CE, in: The Silk Road 13 (2015): 109 – 125.

Róna-Tas, András, Hungarians & Europe in the Early Middle Ages: An Introduction to Early Hungarian History, New York, 1999.

Røstad, Ingunn Marit, The immortal brooch. The tradition of great ornamental bow brooches in Migration and Merovingian Period Norway, Charismatic Objects. From Roman Times to the Middle Ages, Cappelen Damm Akademisk, Chapter 4. , 73 – 101, 2018.

Sanguo Yishi (三國遺事, 삼국유사), Korean History Database (한국사데이터베이스), http://db.history.go.kr/item/level.do?itemId=sy.

Sanguo Shiji (三國史記, 삼국사기), Korean History Database (한국사데이터베이스), http://db.history.go.kr/item/level.do?itemId=sg.

Sachsenspiegel, Sachsenspiegel oder Sächsisches Landrecht, Carl Robert Sachße, Heidelberg, 1848.

San Guo Zhi (三國志), Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/sanguozhi.

Shan Hai Jing 山海經, Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/shan-hai-jing.

Shan Hai Jing Jian Shu 山海經箋疏, Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=en&res=247611.

Shachan, Avigdor, In the Footsteps of the Lost Ten Tribes, English Translation, Tel Aviv, 2007.

Schechter, Solomon, An unknown Khazar document, in: The Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. 3, No. 2 (Oct., 1912), 181-219.

Senstius, Paul, Die Stämme der Israeliten und Germanen, Leipzig, 1931.

Shiji 史記, Records of the Grand Historian, Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/shiji.

Shijing 詩經, das Buch der Lieder, English translation: James Legge, Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/book-of-poetry

Sims-Williams, Nicholas, Further notes on the Bactrian inscription of Rabatak, with an Appendix on the names of Kujula Kadphises and Vima Taktu in Chinese, in: Proceedings of the Third European Conference of Iranian Studies Part 1: Old and Middle Iranian Studies, Wiesbaden, 1998, SS 79–93.

Sims-Williams, Nicholas [Translated by]. Introduction by Prof. Daniel C. Waugh, The Sogdian Ancient Letters 1, 2, 3, and 5, 2004, http://depts.washington.edu/uwch/silkroad/texts/sogdlet.html.

Simonenko, Alexander, Chinese and East Asian Elements in Sarmatian Culture of the North Pontic Region, in: Journal of the Institute of Silk Road Studies, 2001, S. 53 ff..

Skinner, Michael, Marks of Empire: Extracting a Narrative from the Corpus of Kuṣāṇa Inscriptions, Dissertation University of Washington, 2017.

Shin, Chaeho (신채호), Chosun Shanggosa (조선 상고사), Bibong Chulpansa, 2006.

Song Shi (宋史), Chinese Notes, http://chinesenotes.com/songshi.html.

Song Shu (宋書), Chinese Notes, http://chinesenotes.com/songshu.html.

Sohm, Rudolph, Fränkisches Recht und römisches Recht. Prolegomena zur deutschen Rechtsgeschichte, Weimar, 1880.

Stary, Giovanni, The Manchu Identification of Jurchen Clan Names As Found in the "Manjusai da sekiyen-i kimcin" (Manzhou yuanliu kao), Sakhana, A Review 01 Manchu Studies no. 3, 1998.

Stickler, Timo, Die Hunnen, München, 2007.

Strabo, Strabo's Erdbeschreibung, übersetzt und durch Anmerkungen erläutert von Albert Forbiger, Stuttgart, 1856–1862.

Strauss, Victor von , Laò-Tsè's Taò Te King, 1870, Nachdruck 2016.

Sui Shu (隋書), Chinese Notes, http://chinesenotes.com/suishu.html.

Svetlana Borinskaya u.a., Distribution of the Alcohol Dehydrogenase ADH1B*47His Allele in Eurasia, in: The American Journal of Human Genetics 84, 89–94, January 9, 2009.

Tacitus, Publius Cornelius**,**

Historiae/Historien. Lateinisch/Deutsch. Übersetzt und Herausgegeben von Helmuth Vretska, 1986.

Die Germania des Tacitus, Deutsche Übersetzung von Anton Baumstark, Freiburg, 1876.

Thompson, Michele, Scripts, Signs, and Swords: The Việt Peoples and the Origins of Nôm, Sino-Platonic Papers, 101, 2000.

Tobias, Bendeguz, Karin Wiltschke-Schrotta, Michaela Binder, Das langobardenzeitliche Gräberfeld von Wien-Mariahilfer Gürtel. Mit einem Beitrag zur künstlichen Schädeldeformation im westlichen Karpatenbecken, in: Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz 57 (2010), 279-337.

Tongdian (通典), Wiki Source, https://zh.wikisource.org/wiki/通典.

Trigault, Nicolas S. J., China in the Sixteenth Century: The Journals of Mathew Ricci: 1583-1610, New York, 1953.

Oota, H., N. Saitou, T. Matsushita, and S. Ueda, Molecular genetic analysis of remains of a 2,000-year-old human population in China—and its relevance for the origin of the modern Japanese population, in: American Journal of Human Genetics, 64, . 1999, 250–258.

Vennemann, Theo, Griechisch, lateinisch, etruskisch, karthagisch? Zur Herkunft der Runen, in: Veröffentlichungen des Nationalen Forschungsschwerpunks „Medienwandel – Medienwechsel – Medienwissen, Bd. 15, Zürich, 2011, 47-82.

Vernadsky, George, The Origins of Russia, New York, 1959.

Vogel, Hans Ulrich, Marco Polo "Was" in China: New Evidence from Currencies, Salts and Revenues, Leiden, Boston, 2013.

Vondrovec, Klaus: *Die Anonymen Clanchefs. Der Beginn der Alchon-Prägung*. In: *Numismatische Zeitschrift* 113/114, 2005, S. 176–191.

Wang Guowei (王國維), Yuan Gaoli Jishi (元高麗紀事, Geschichte des Yuan-Goryeo Krieges), Korean History Database, (한국사데이터베이스), http://db.history.go.kr/KOREA/item/level.do?itemId=cnwk&types=r.

White, William Charles, Chinese Jews, 2. Edition, New York, 1966.

Wei Shu 魏書, Chinese Notes, http://chinesenotes.com/weishu.html.

Weisz, Tiberiu, The Kaifeng Stone Inscriptions Revisited, in: Covenant – Global Jewish Magazin, Vol. 1, Issue 3, 2007.

Werner, Joachim, Beiträge zur Archäologie des Attila-Reiches, München, 1956.

Wu Yue Chunqiu (吳越春秋), Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/wu-yue-chun-qiu.

Wirth, Kai Helge, Der Ursprung der Sternbilder, 2000.

Wolfram, Haupt, Kusternig, Quellen zur Geschichte des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts, Darmstadt, 1982.

Xin Tang Shu 新唐書, Chinese Notes, http://chinesenotes.com/xintangshu.html

Yang, Xiaoneng, Chinese Archaeology in the Twentieth Century, Kansas City, 2004.

Yuejueshu 越絕書, Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/yue-jue-shu.

Yatsenko, Sergey A.,

Yuezhi on Bactrian Embroidery from Textiles Found at Noyon uul, Mongolia, in: *The Silk Road* 10 (2012), 39–48.

Yuan Shi 元史, Chinese Notes, http://chinesenotes.com/yuanshi.html.

Yu, Taishan,

兩漢魏晉南北朝正史西域傳要注, 北京: 中華書局, 2005.

The Origin of the Kushans, Sino-Platonic Papers, Number 212, 2011.

Αλχovo Coins and the Ethnicity of the Hephthalites, in: Eurasian Studies, English Edition II, 2014, S. 38.

Yu zhi zengding Qingwen jian 御制增订清文鉴, Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=en&res=260795&remap=gb

Zeuss, Kaspar, Die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme, München, 1837.

Wimmer, Ludwig Franz, Die Runenschrift, Berlin, 1886.

Wolfram, Herwig, Die Goten, München 2001.

Za Bao Zang Jing 雜寶藏經, Wiki Source, https://zh.wikisource.org/zh-hant/%E9%9B%9C%E5%AF%B6%E8%97%8F%E7%B6%93

Zarnke, Friedrich, Der Priester Johannes, Leibzig, 1879.

Zhou Shu (周書), Chinese Notes, http://chinesenotes.com/zhoushu.html.

Zhushu Jinian 竹書紀年, Chinese Text Project, https://ctext.org/searchbooks.pl?if=en&searchu=%E7%AB%B9%E6%9B%B8%E7%B4%80%E5%B9%B4.

Zhu, James Xueyuan, The Far-East Ancestors of the Magyars: A Historical and Linguistic Excavation, in: International Journal of Central Asian Studies, Volume 4, 1999.

Zuckerman, Constantin, On the Date of the Khazars' Conversion to Judaism and the Chronology of the Kings of the Rus Oleg and Igor. A Study of the Anonymous Khazar Letter from the Genizah of Cairo. Revue des Études Byzantines 53 (1995) 237–270 Oleg and Igor. A Study of the Anonymous Khazar Letter from the Genizah of Cairo. Revue des Études Byzantines 53 (1995), 237–270.

Comments from Academia.edu Session

Participants:

Israel Palchan, Vener Akhmetov, Constantine Hatzidimitriou, Peter B Golden, Huaan Chang, Florin Curta, Albert Kaganovitch, Marcel Erdal, Alex M Feldman, Osman Karatay, Chris Blake, Simon Berger, Jaka Vanindo, Mohammad Mushfequr Rahman

Peter B Golden
2 mos ago

Reports on Khazar linguistic affiliations are muddled. Al-Iṣṭaxrī, writing before 950, remarksthat “the language of the Khazars is not the language of the Turks and the Persians (nor) is the language of any other faction of humanity associated with it.” But, elsewhere (in his comments one the Burṭās, he states that “the language of the Bulğars is like that (mitla) of the Khazars.” Al-Muqaddasī, writing 988/989, declares that “the language of the Khazars is quite incomprehensible [šadīd al-inġilāq].” Al-Bīrūnī (d. 1048), in a work completed in 1000, reports that Volga Bulğaric was a “mixture of Turkic and Khazar.” In My "Khazar Studies" (Budapest, 1980), I discussed all the known Khazar words. The results are mixed. We cannot say with certainty that the Khazars spoke a form of West Old Turkic/Bulğaric/Oğuric or a form of East Old Turkic. In all likelihood, representatives of both branches of Old Turkic were present.

Unlike 5

Israel Palchan
2 mos ago
See languages spoken after Khazars at same places that are not Turkish. You"ll find Slavic. Think what Bulgars could speak at 10 AD. You can think about Slavic that they speak now also.

Like

Ha-Sung H . Chung
1 mo ago
Dear Professor Golden, Thank you very much for your attention. I am a fan of your many works which make me freeze in awe because of their depth and sensitivity. I wonder whether the Monglic script, also known as Hudum Mongol bichig, is not also derived from the ancient Hebrew-Aramaic alphabet, and not from the Sogdic alphabet as most scholars assume. It is a fact that the royal line of the Korean Joseon Dynasty were Mongols. The father of the state founder Lee Seonggae, Lee Jachun (李子春) was a Darughachi in Goryeo and had the Mongolian name Ulus Buha (吾魯思不花). Lee Seonggae's grandson, King Sejong, introduced the Korean alphabet in 1443. The Korean alphabet can undoubtedly be traced back to the Old Hebrew-Aramaic alphabet.

Like 1

Peter B Golden
1 mo ago

Thank you very much for your kind words. Alphabets move around (often with religions) and the question of the origins of the variants of the Aramaic script used in Central Asia is still the subject of discussion. The Mongol script was taken from the Uyghur variant of the Sogdian (Aramaic) script system. The Manchus borrowed their script system from Mongol. I cannot speak with any authority about the script system invented by King Sejong. It is unlikely that it was not influenced by the Mongol system, which would have been known to him. The Hebrew alphabet is a form of Aramaic. It superseded the Palaeo-Hebrew alphabet, which is akin to the script used by the Samaritans.

Unlike 3

Huaan Chang
1 mo ago

Uyghur borrowed Turkic Runic Alphabets to develop their Runic letters. Turks borrowed Sauromatian Runic Alphabets to develop their Runic script. Sauromatians borrowed Gothic Runic Alphabets to develop their Runic Script when they were neighbor in Europe. Since Turkic linguists worldwide are not aware of the Sauromatian Rune, they have speculated that Turkic Orkhon Rune is derived from the Aramatic-Sogdia Letters, but the basic forms and the lines of the two scripts are quite different. Danish linguist V. L. Thomsen (1842-1927), who successfully deciphered Orkhon Runes, has also found that there are 15 Orkhon Runic symbols not found in the Aramaic-Sogdia Letters. This precludes that fact that Turkic Rune was derived from Aramaic-Sogdia.

Like 1

Peter B Golden
1 mo ago

Yes, the arguments over the origins of the Türk runiform script continue.

Like 2

Huaan Chang
1 mo ago

One puts the cart before the horse to say the Issyk inscription (Figure 100) is written in Turkic Runic Alphabets. Similarly, when some Turkic scholars deduced that Saka-Massagetae spoke a Turkic language, it is a misunderstanding based on erroneous Kyzakyhstan archaeologists dating of the Issyk kurgan. It is unrealistic to expect an oriental nomad to develop a written language based on Gothic Runic Alphabets without a central link. The early Turks did not have a written language, nor did they

have a uniform spoken language; each tribe had its own dialect. The emergence of Turkic Alphabets not only unified the “1,000 nays and 10,000 clans” of the Tu-jue tribes, it also laid the foundation for the Turkic language to become powerful as many ethnic groups began to speak Turkic. According to New Tang Shu, Chapter 233 “Kyrgyz Biography,” both the written and the spoken language of Uyghur and Kyrgyz were turkiclized during the 8th-9th centuries. They could be the first two non-Turkish nations to be turkiclized. Figure 100 Sauromatian Issyk Runic inscriptions on a silver bowl. From A. Amanjolov, History and Theory of Ancient Turkic-219. Script, pp. 218 As for the Turks’ written language, Chinese chronicle Zhou Shu, Chapter 50, once recorded, “Turkish writings look like foreign words.” Bei Qi Shu, Chapter 20, also adds, “Emperor Hou-ju [reign 565-577 CE] edicted Liu Shi-qing to translate Mahayana Mahaparinirvana Sutra (涅槃經) into Turkic and send the translation to Tu-jue Qaghan.” Apparently the Turks already had had a written language since the second half of the 6th century CE. Very likely their written language was composed of Runic alphabets borrowed from Sauromatian Runic Alphabets. Another Chinese chronicle, Sui Shu, Chapter 84, states that “the Turks have no written language; they record events by carving symbols on wooden plates.” Zhangsun Chen (長孫晟) or historiographers of the Sui Dynasty were mistaken to consider the Turkic Runic Alphabets as symbols.

Like

Peter B Golden
1 mo ago

The First Türk Qaghanate(552-630 in east) has left two inscriptions (discovered thus far), Bugut and Khüis Tolgoi. Sogdian was used, as this was the lingua franca of the Silk Road. In addition, there are lines in Brāhmī script that have been interpreted as Mongol (probably the Mongol of the Rouran). Sasha Vovin has published papers on this which can be found on Academia.edu. Whether the Ashina tribe and ruling clan of the Türks originally spoke a Turkic language or possibly a variant of Saka rem... Read More

Like 2

Huaan Chang
1 mo ago

The Mahayana Mahaparinirvana Sutra (涅槃經) send to Tapar Qaghan under the edict of Emperor Hou-ju (reign 565-577 CE) of Eastern Wei should be in Turkic Runes translated by Liu Shi-qing who should be a Sauromatian descendant understood both Turkic Runes and Sauromatian Runes.

Like

Peter B Golden
1 mo ago

We don't know that. Where is the evidence of his Sauromatian descent and how do we know that he used a runic script?

Like 1

Ha-Sung H . Chung
1 mo ago

This discussion between two Scholars with deep knowledge of the West and East and inbetween is really interesting and exciting at the same time. However, I sometimes have the impression that different views on a certain subject are often not real one, but is only a misunderstanding based on different usage of words. For example the word Turkish: Does it mean the people of Turks (what is it anyway?) or the Turkish language. Or the word China. What do you mean with that? Who are Chinese and what is the Chinese language? Aren't Turks Chinese? Why not? What is certain is that there were tons of peoples and languages in China (as a geological place), and some of them went west to the Eurasian steppe, to be called by western observers as Turks, Huns, Sarmatians, Kazakhs, Khazars, Rui Rui , Uighurs, Kushans, Tiele, Hephthalites, Mongols, Avars, etc.. Who had which scripts and who adapted them from whom is of secondary importance to me in this regard. In this context, it is important to note that there was a second, a phonetic script besides the well known semantic Chinese script. The question then arises whether this writing came from the west, i.e. via the Alexanders's Hellenes to the east, or by other ways. In this context it is extremely important to state that the “Chinese” alphabet is not derived from Greek, but from the much older Paleo-Hebrew-Aramaic or even from the Phoenician alphabet. Then of course the question arises who, when and how this script was brough to China. Your note, Huaan Chang 先生, causes some difficulty in comprehending for you use the word "Sauromatian" denoting people in China, which as unusual, to say at least. It would be easier to understand if we use the word "Yuezhi" instead. If one accepts this then Professor Golden’s two questions could have a chance to be answered: 1. Where is the evidence that Liu Shi-qing is of Sauromatian (Yuezhi) descent? In the year 229 AD the Kushan king Vasudava, called Bodiao (波調) in Chinese sources, sent an embassy to the court of the Wei Dynasty (魏朝). The Wei Emperor awarded him the title "King of the Great Yuezhi (大月氏 王)". Apparently this was important for the Kushan king as he made expensive gifts for this title. Kushan did not have to fear the Wei Dynasty. It was more than 5,000 kilometers away from them, and furthermore Wei was engaged in the war with other Chinese states at the time: this was the era of the "Three Warring States". The Kushans were Yuezhis, who called themselves "Zhaowu 9 Xing (昭武 九姓)", 9 families of the Zhaowu in Central Asia. It's not far from Zhowu to Sauromats. The investur of the royal title between Wei and Kushan could be an indication of their ethnic unity. The Northern Wei later continues the legacy of Wei Dynasty. 2. How do we know that they used a runic script? The Sogdian letters found by Aurel Stein

could be evidence for the existence Yuezhi script. They are also called Hu scripts in other sources. 1. These letters were written in an alphabet belonging to the Phoenician script family but not derived from Greek. 2. Seeing the writer as a Sogdian trader, as most scholars do, is inappropriate. Why should someone traveled from Sogdiana to China during this period of turmoil? The author has too deep an understanding of the historical processes of the 5 Hu 16 States Period. He knows that the immigrant Yis (夷) were in the process of subjugating the established Hua (華), the Jin Empire. 3. In terms of content, the author distances himself from the Xiongnus, the author hates the Xiongnus. Therefore, the author can only be of the Yuezhi people for between Xiongnus and Yuezhis there had been enmity since 200 BC, if not longer.

Like

Huaan Chang
1 mo ago

1. Please refer my reply 4 daysago on this topic. 2. Do you know China has about 80millions Sauromatian (Y-DNA N) descendants based on Y-DNA exam. Result ? Among them about 15 millions are Scythians (Y-DNA R1a). 3. I am,so far, the sole researcher of Sauromatians in Taiwan and Mainland China. I am the author of The Eastward Migration of the Sauromatians in four different Chinese editions. The English version,with the help of Dr. Jeannie Davis-Kimball, who is an expert in this field, is dedicated to non-Chinese speaking scholars and readers to provide an introduction about this important missing chapter in European history.

Like

Peter B Golden
1 mo ago

Sauromatian is a variant of the ethnonym Sarmatian (Σαρμάται, Σαυρομάται, Sarmatae). The general consensus is that they were Iranian-speakers (like their predecessors, the Scythians, called Saka in Persian and in the East). The presence of Y-DNA markers pointing to Saka populations in (N. China) is hardly remarkable. Indeed, it is expected, given the Saka populations of Xinjiang, Gansu etc. As for the Yuezhi-Kushan connection, much has been written (and argued) about it. The Yuezhi who came to Graeco-Bactria appear to have contained Tokharian and Iranian elements. In any event, the Kushans adopted the local Iranian language (often written in Greek script).

Like 1

Huaan Chang
1 mo ago

1. Sauromatians and Sarmatians are same people but different dialect. Strabo (63/64 BCE-24CE) mentioned Sarmatians in a number of places, but did not comment much about them. He also uses both Sarmatai and Sauromatai, but never together, and he has never suggested that they are different peoples. Although Strabo has used the term Iazyges Sarmatian (IV 17), he has never associated Sarmatian with Ugri or Roxolani. The reason may be that the Iazyges pronounced their tribe name,Sarmatae, while the Urgi and Roxolani pronounced theirs Sauromatae. As the Roxolazni lived near Greece, between the Danbue and Dniper in the 2nd century, this may be the reason Pausanis used the appellation Sauromatae in his writings. This could also explain why Ammianus Marcellinus termed the Iazyges tribes that lived in Hungary as Sarmatian (17.12.2)while the Ugri, Scythian and Roxolani tribes that lived between the lower reaches of the Danbue River and the Don River were Sauromatae (31.2.13). From the writings of Russian archaeologists I have found that, in general, they do not know the relationship between Sauromatian and Sarmatian. From M. I. Roslevtzeffi forward,Russians have mis-identified the Alans and the Aorsi kurgans in southern Ural steppes as "Sauromatian" or "Sarmatian" kurgans. This is why M. I. Roslevtzeffi negated the possibility of genetic tie between Sauromatian and "Sarmatian," as he thought "Sarmatians" came from the east and hence were Iranian in origin,and their culture bore the Iranian features. In 1988 the Russian archaeologist, M. A. Ochir-Goryayevaz, conducted a comparative analysis on the burial complexes of the 6th-4th centuries BCE in the lower Volg River region and southern Ural steppe region.Criteria used in her study included a few main cultural traits such as burial rites, hand-modeled pottery, and weapons. On the grounds of established difference, the author postulated the existence of two different archaeological cultures, one in lower Volga River area and the other in the southern Ural steppe region. K. F. Smirnov, the Russian archaeologist also noticed the great similarity between the "animal style" art found in the southern Ural steppe and that of the Saka-Massagetae, illustrated by the paucity of fighting animal scenes and geometric patterns. B. N. Grakov proposed that Sauromatian and "Sarmatian" had ethnogenetic ties, and that the merger of the Sauromatian tribes and the original "Sarmatian" tribes created a single Sarmatian tribe.However, these notions, I presume, were based on misreading of traditional western literatures and mis-interpretation of archaeological data. 2. There are different dialects in the Sau-ro (Sou-le 疏勒) state in Xinjiang; some tribes pronounced their state "Sau-ro" and some "Sa-r." Be it "Sau-ro" (Sou-le') or "Sa-r" (Sha-le'), these tribes should be the descendants of the Sauromatae or Sarmatae who had migrated from around the Caspian Sea. In any case, it is a mistake to pronounce "疏勒" (Sau-ro) as "Su-le". According to Han Shu's "Western Regions Biography" (regions west of Dun-hwang), the Sau-ro state "controls 1,510 households with a population of 18,647, including 2,000 men able to bear arms." Also, Chapter 12 of Hsuan-Tsang Xi-yu-Ji (or Great Tang Records on the Western Regions) states, "With fierce disposition, they [the Sau-ro] are untrustworthy, emotionless to their guests and superficial in their knowledge and skills. They practice cranial deformation on their new born babies to elongate their heads. They look ugly, their bodies tattooed and their eyes green. It is untraceable when the Sau-ro people settled down in the Kachgar area. However,from their custom of cranial deformation, their arrival time should be before the 5th century BCE,as only a limited scale of early Sauromatians in the easternmost regions used this practice. In addition to Sau-ro, there were other peoples in today's Xinjiang Province who also practiced cranial deformation, such as Kut-si (屈支),Gu-z (車師), and Yue-zhi (月氏); all of them

were tribes of the same race. 3. Based on the inscribed tribe names found in Olbia, Tanais, and Panticapaeum, some western scholars have assumed that Sauromatians spoke a northeastern Iranian dialect similar to the language by the Caucasus Ossetians or by the Sogdians. There are also suggestions that the Sauromatian language came from the Finno-Ugrian groups, which includes some early forms of Hungarian. However, based on Xuan-zang Si-Yu-Ki (Great Tang Records on the Western Regions), Chapter 12 “Ka-Shi (Kashgar) Kingdom,” “Their [Sau-ro’s] language and pronunciations are different from those of the surrounding countries.” In addition, Wei Shu, Chapter 102 “Hephthalites Biography” also records, “They [Hephthalites] have a language different from Juan-juan (Rou-ran), Ko-ch, and other foreign countries.” In other words, the Sauromatian language could not be Persian, Turkic, or Tocharian, but a language totally different from the ones spoken by the surrounding peoples. The Y chromosome haplogroup indicates the Sauromatians should speak a Uralic language. The appearance of vocabulary of common origin, pronoun similarities and vowel harmony in Turkic, Mongolic and Tungusic languages as in Uralic languages should have been borrowed from Sauromatians. No wonder the hypothesis of Ural-Altaic languages or Altaic languages has been rejected since 1960s.

Like

Ha-Sung H . Chung
1 mo ago

Huaan, do you have any hint about origin and meaning of the name Khazar (可薩) in Chinese sources and/or studies?

Like

Huaan Chang
1 mo ago

Chinese documents only have its name and location, I think they were from a captured Tang soldier in Syria.

Like

Peter B Golden
1 mo ago

The etymology of the name "Khazar"/Qazar remains unresolved. The Chinese forms 突厥可薩 Tujue Kesa or 可薩突厥 Kesa Tujue “Türk-Qazar,” “Qazar-Türk,” 突厥曷薩 Tujue Hesa "Türk-Khazar" are

discussed in Shirota, Shun. 2005. "The Chinese Chronicles of the Khazars: Notes on Khazaria in Tang Period Texts" in: Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi 14: 231-261. The Chinese data on the Khazars stems from 杜環 Du Huan, who was captured at the Battle of the Talas (751), spent time in Iraq and perhaps Africa, returning to China in 762. His full account has been lost, but parts of it are preserved in later sources, see Endymion Wilkinson, Chinese History. A New Manual, 5th ed. Harvard University, Asia Center (2018):827. The 葛薩 Gesa tribe of the Uyghurs was suggested as transcribing the Khazars (Parker, Pelliot, Dunlop, with variants on this in Kliashtornyi and others) but the connection is far from certain.

Unlike 2

Ha-Sung H . Chung
1 mo ago

The Khazars Turks had a Torah in possession when they arrived in Dagestan. Then it is not wrong to search in the Bible for the etymological origin of the word Khazar. The Hebrew etynomial hazak חזק could stand for Khazar. The names Hezekiel and Hezekiah stem from this etynomial. Following folk, tribal or family names could be associated with Khazar.. 黑齒國 Heichiguo from 山海經, 海外 東經 黑齒 國 in Hou Han Shu, Volume 85 卷八 十五 東夷 列傳 第七 十五 Treatise on the Dongyi Fuyu; Yilou; Gaojuli; Woju; Huimo; Sanhan; Wo. 黑 齒 常 之 Hezisangzi, name of a Baekje General (630 to 689) who became Tang general. 夾谷 Chaku, family name of Jurchen nobility, the Hungarian variant of which shall be Csarszar, Csiszar, Zhu, James Xueyuan, The Far-East Ancestors of the Magyars: A Historical and Linguistic Excavation, in: International Journal of Central Asian Studies, Volume 4, 1999, Appendix IV. We find a striking number of tribal or family names among the Mohe, Jurchen, Khitans and Koreans that can be associated with the names of the Israelite tribe or family names. Malchiel מַלְכִּיאֵל. son of Asher: Mohe (靺 鞨, Malgal or Malgil in Korean). They became Magyars in Hungary. Mieerqi (蔑 兒 乞, Myeolageol in Korean): Mother of Genghis Khans belonged to this clan. Jahleel יַחְלְאֵל, son of Sebulun: Yelü 耶律 clan, royal clan of Khitan, pronounced Yelioi in Manchu. Jachin יָכִין son of Simeon: Jurchen (女眞, pronounced Yeozin in Korean. Joseon 朝鮮 Shelah שֵׁלָה son of Judah: 新羅, Shilla. Korah קרח Levites 蓋樓, Gaeru; 高麗 Goryeo Becher בֶּכֶר, son of Ephraim: 百濟, Baekje

Like

Huaan Chang
1 mo ago

I think the 葛薩 Gesa is the last name of one of nine chieftains of the nine original Uyghurs tribes, not tribe name as suggested by some reserachers. One researcher suggested the tribe 曷嶡 of Telie transcribed to the Khazars. All of them are baseless.

Like

Vener Akhmetov
1 mo ago

If you look at the records of Biruni, then he knew the usual Turkic Z-language. Therefore, the languages of the Khazars and Bulgarians, he saw the Türkic Z-language, which was understandable to him, and the not quite understandable Türkic R-language. Although there were also Indo-European and Hungarian languages.

Like 1

Peter B Golden
1 mo ago

We have no idea if Biruni knew Turkic of any variety or was simply repeating what he had heard or read elsewhere. Biruni was a very original scholar, a polymath. In addition to his native tongue, Khwarazmian Iranian, he knew Persian (Farsi) and Arabic. H may have acquired some Indic, as he was the first scholar to write about Indic South Asia. It is not impossible that he had some familiarity with Turkic as the Oghuz and other Turkic peoples were in the neighborhood. As I noted previously, having examined the Khazar words recorded in a variety of sources and looked at the manuscripts in which they are recorded. it is difficult to say that the Khazars spoke only East Old Turkic (Z-Turkic) or West Old Turkic (Oghuric/Bulgharic). Some words are best explained by one, others by the other.

Like 3

Ha-Sung H . Chung
29 days ago

Ahmad al-Biruni was indeed a most remarkable personality, perhaps comparable to Aristotle or Leibniz: a universal scholar in the truest sense of the word. His astronomical research, for example, is remarkable, as J. B. Biot, Etudes sur I'dstronomie Indienne et Chinoise (Paris, 1862 p. 247 points. The systematisation of the 24 stellar points of antiquity into the 28 siu was the work of the founders of the Tchou dynasty in imitation of what they had learned from the astronomy of Kwarism, where, according to Albiruni's statement, great progress had been made in that science since 1304 b.c, and among others the harmonization of the solar and lunar cyclos. The 28 siu (The Twenty-Eight Mansions (二十八宿, Èrshíbā Xiù) is the foundation of Chinese carthography which is still a puzzle today.

Like 1

Vener Akhmetov
25 days ago

Biruni's compatriots, the Khorezm merchants in the land of the Khazars and Bulgars, understood the situation there better than anyone else, and especially the languages as an instrument of communication between the Khorezmians and them. The dream of Khorezm merchants to trade without borders came true in 1236 when the lands of the states were united into the empire of the descendants of Genghis Khan (this idea was expressed by the archaeologist S.P. Tolstov (1939-1948), who dug the cities of the Khorezm civilization). Therefore, it is very valuable that Biruni recorded the opinion of his fellow Khorezmians about the language situation of the Khazars and Bulgarians. Indeed, there is an opinion (I don't remember exactly who) that the name of the peoples of the Bulgarians can be explained from the Tatar language: for "Bulgarians" (Botka, Bulgarians, Bulgarians) comes from a mixture, just like their descendants in the language "Chuvash" (Chualu, Chualysh) ... The poet Akmulla wrote about 19-20 centuries "atyng bulgar bulsa bulsyn, ilne bulgar bulmasyn". The materials of the skull bones of the early Bulgarians from the lands of "Samara Bow = Самарская лука" also show a mixture of races. Presumably, the geographical position of the lands of the Bulgarians and Khazars is a corridor for the migration of different peoples. Did Biruni know the Turkic languages? Biruni, who lived in 973-1048, gives the calendar terms of the neighbors of Khorezm Kashgar, which coincides with the dictionary of Mahmud Kashgar 1074, and their years of life are the same. From this I conclude that Biruni knew or learned from oral conversation (Biruni describes a non-written language) of the Karakhanid Turks (and the neighboring Turks who wrote in Nestorian, Brahmi and Tocharian symbols), but not the Buddhist Uighurs. I studied the issue of calendar terms and came to this conclusion.

Like

Constantine Hatzidimitriou
29 days ago

Why is Dunlop's History of the Jewish Khazars in the bibliography. Is it not a classic?

Like

Peter B Golden
29 days ago

For modern Khazar Studies it is foundational. I had the good fortunate to study medieval Arab history with him in 1964 and he sat on my PhD dissertation committee some years later. A great scholar and a very decent human being.

Like 1

Ha-Sung H . Chung
29 days ago
Thank both of you. I will study it carefully.

Like

Constantine Hatzidimitriou
29 days ago
He was my teacher also and I fully agree with everything Professor Golden says...

Like 2

Vener Akhmetov
2 mos ago
The language of the Khazars and Bulgars, according to the Arab authors of that time, as dialects of the same language. According to the language of the epigraphy in the Middle Volga around the town of Bolgar, their language is Turkic r type (dated between 1289-1357). Similar to the dialects of modern Chuvash. Although there could be other languages like Hebrew. There are no written monuments about other languages.

Like 1

Ha-Sung H . Chung
2 mos ago
Dear Vener, Thank you for the valuable note. The German ancient historian and classical philologist Franz Altheim claimed in his booklet “Hunnische Runen “, Halle, 1948, that Proto-Bulgarians had used Turkish runes. He identified the inscriptions on objects from the Nagyszentmiklós treasure as Turkish runic writing. He also put forward the thesis that the origin of the Turkish runic writing is the

ancient Hebrew-Aramaic alphabet. The Huns would also have used this script. I believe therefore that the Khazarian Bible was written in the ancient Hebrew-Aramaic alphabet.

Like 2

Israel Palchan
2 mos ago

Concerning evidences for colloquall language of Khazars and Bulgars. Bulgars speak now slavic language. Where from and when they get it? From middle Age epigraphy and may be word borrowings they should speak Turkish. Part of them placed at same place as modern Bulgaria known to transit to Slavic actually from 10 century. Not to Greek or German languages of powerful neighbours but to Slavic. The only origin for Slavic at 10 and 9 ventures left to be Khazars places and people of Khazaria that have pushed Bulgars west and to Volga north . If so the process , the same colloquial language changing could occur also for Bulgars sitting on upper Volga or Itil, as it has occurred to Duna Bulgars. Also we have written evidence for Slavic names in so called" Kievan letter". Part of assigned personal names are Slavic. Also, if not to cover the evidence about two different types of people organising Khazaria by sociological argumentation that is direct pointing on two different ethnoses in Khazaria. One of them Turkish, known and named as Ashine tribe. The only choose for the second is to be Slavic. And we may see this in history of after Turkish time when all Khazarian in Past territories changed to be obvious Slavic . The Turkish ephygraphy of 13 and 14 centuries on Bulgars Volga doesn't prove that they don't speak slavic Russian language the same days .

Unlike 1

Ha-Sung H . Chung
1 mo ago

If I understand you correctly, you are of the opinion that the Khazars were bilingual. They spoke Turkish and Slavic. Is it also correct that the Russians spoke Slavic and Hebrew? That would coincide with my thesis in my paper that the Khazars met the Tiele people and together they built the Khazar empire. The immigrating Khazar spoke Turkish, the natives spoke Slavic. Slav could etymologically come from Tiele. Incidentally, the Tiele are also associated with the Xianbeis (鮮卑). According to Omeljan Pritsak Xianbei was pronounced in EMC Sirbi/Serbi. Serbs of today are Slavic people.

Like

Vener Akhmetov
1 mo ago

According to Syrian sources (Pigulevskaya N. 1941), in 544 Bishop Kardost translated the Bible into the language of the Huns. What was the writing then, only runic. There are Sabirs, possibly a Turkic R-language, as a dialect of the Khazar and Bulgarian languages. There were attempts to decipher the Khazar runic inscriptions, but no success. The difficulty is that they are very short (I have also been trying to decipher them for many years). Although it can be assumed that the Karaites in Crimea (especially the Karaites migrants from Crimea to Golitsia in the West of Ukraine and Trakai in Lithuania preserved the more ancient language). Their Bible is in Aramaic script and may be left over from the Khazars. The Khazar origin of the Karaites is controversial, but it has a right to exist. The language is also ancient, not Ottoman, like the Crimean Karaites. The texts of the ancient Bibles of the Karaites have been studied and published. I found some of them in the Crimea and Lithuania.

Unlike 2

Peter B Golden
30 days ago

As we do not have the text of Kardost's translation, we cannot state categorically that it was in one of the Turkic runic scripts. There are many other possibilities. The few examples of Sabir have been collected and discussed in my "Khazar Studies" I: 256-259. Xianbei 鮮卑, recent studies argue, represent *Serbi, see Old Chin. *s[a]r.pe Middle Chin. sjen.pije (Baxter and Sagart, 2014: 261-262, 346); Old Chin. sen/san pe Late Han sian-pie, Middle Chin, sjän pjie (Schuessler, 2009: 248 [23-21a), 127 [7-29a]). Sabir may represent a metathesized form of Serbi. Yes, the theory of the Khazar origins of the Karaites is quite controversial. Karaite sources of the era speak quite negatively of them, terming them "mamzerim" ("bastards"). The theory gained some ground thanks to Firkowicz and other Karaites who were trying to exempt the Karaites from the anti-Semitic restrictions that were being placed on Jews by the Tsarist government. Karaite dejudiazation was a conscious political decision of the early 20th century pushed forward by Süreyya Šapšal. It ended up saving the majority of them from the Holocaust. The dwindling East European Karaite population of today considers itself Turkic , with some exceptions. The Karaites of Crimea speak their variant of Crimean Tatar, although Russification is quite extensive. The language of the Karate communities in Lithuania (Trakai) and Poland speak a more archaic form, close to the Cumanic language of the Armenians who adopted Cuman in Crimea (the language is preserved in judicial documents written in Armeno-Cuman, some centuries earlier. The Karaite language of the Lithuanian and Polish Karaites may rightly be considered endangered - there are few speakers, but there has been some attempt to revive it among the Karaites of Lithuania. Mikhail Kizilov has written a number of excellent books on the Karaites of Early Modern and Modern times. The Karaite translation of the Bible has many interesting archaic features, but is also heavily influenced by the Hebrew text, often preserving the grammatical structures of Hebrew rather than Turkic. Karaite publications of Modern times (esp. 20th century) show strong influences from neighboring Slavic languages . I studied the Karaite texts, old and new, in the 1960s, while a graduate student in Turkey.

Unlike 3

Ha-Sung H . Chung
29 days ago

Franz Altheim in Hunnische Runen, 1948 mentions 3 books in Hunnic language. "Nach der syrischen Chronik des Zacharias von Mitylene wurde 507 oder 508 der Bischof Qardüst von Arrän mit drei Priestern und vier anderen Männern ins Land der Hunnen gesandt, wobei sie viele rhomäische Gefangene und sogar einige Hunnen tauften. Sie blieben dort sieben Jahre und brachten Bücher in hunnischer Sprache heraus 1)." • 1) 12,7; S,229f. der Übersetzung von F. J. Hamilton und E. W. Brooks (1899). Dazu noch J . Marquart, Osteurop. u. ostasiat. Streifzüge 191 Anm. 1. Die Kenntnis der Stelle verdanke ich H. Junker

Like 1

Vener Akhmetov
1 mo ago

I do not agree that the Slavic language appeared on the earth after the Khazars. According to Moscow State University professor Artamonov, according to archaeological data, the architecture of the city of Kiev was founded by the Khazars and then became Slavic. The steppe south of Kiev has always been occupied by nomads. The nomads were Bulgarians, Khazars (Turkic R language or a mixture of Turkic, Proto-Hungarian and other languages), the language of the Cossacks, where a mixture of Slavic and Turkic. The Slavs colonized up to the Caucasus after the Turkic-speaking Tatars, there were also Caucasian languages. Slavicization of the steppes south of Kiev after the conquest of the Crimean Khanate (vassal of the Ottoman Empire) by the Russian Empire around 1775. After the defeat of the Khazars and before the Mongol conquest in 1236, could there be a Slavic language on the territory of the Khazars, they did not have sufficient military strength to penetrate there. The Khazar lands south of Kiev were occupied by the Kipchak Turks (Polovtsy, Cumans) and the Oguz Turks (Guzes, Pechenegs), both Turkic groups of languages in the third language, in contrast to the R Turkic Khazars and Bulgarians. In the east were the Finno-Ugric tribes of the cities of Moscow, Ryazan, Murom. Although their Slavic and Norman colonization began. The Bulgarians on the Volga showed their language in writing, in epigraphy (1289-1357) only after the Tatar conquest in 1236, this is evidence of the existence of the Khazar Bulgarian R Turkic language after the Khazars. There should have been Indo-Iranian or Baltic languages from the Imenkovo archaeological culture, but they do not have a written language. Thanks to the culture of the more civilized Tatars, the Muslim Bulgarians had a written fixation of the Bulgarian language, there is no data about the Khazar (their runic writing has not been deciphered, the Bulgarians on the Volga also have about 10 runic texts, although there were attempts to decipher it. Also in Hungary and the inscriptions of the treasure of Attila Nagy Saint Miklos). We still see the continuation of the Bulgarian and Khazar languages in living dialects of the

modern Chuvash language. Although the Bulgarians lost their language and switched to Tatar (not Mongolian), the epigraphy is strictly in Tatar (mixed with the Arabic language of religion). The languages of the North Caucasus also became Turkic like Kumyk, although there is a Circassian language. Bulgarians on the Danube were few in number and dissolved in the Slavs. Serbs, Croats and other Slavs were formed from the Avars, Huns, Bulgarians, other peoples, and not only from the Slavs. They are also a mixture. DNA materials are interesting, but statistics are still scarce. There is a lot of Ossetian or Alanian DNA in Tatarstan. There is a lot of Alanian archeology in Crimea, but they themselves became Turks, Tatars. There were goths, too, dissolved. As for the Slavic language, there are no ancient written monuments, they appear as Cossacks in the recent life of the Crimean Khanate and the capture of the Kazan Khanate in 1552 and the capture of the city of Astrakhan, the entire Volga and the Khazar region.

Unlike 1

Ha-Sung H . Chung
29 days ago

@ Vener. From your comment and from your other works I see that you have made serious efforts to resolve the confusion about the steppe peoples who are the ancestors of most of the Europeans. For this you deserve my greatest admiration and I would like to encourage you to continue your works. I also see also that you are also doing researches at the other end of the chain, namely in the Far East (such as Mongols). The steppe peoples (a term that caused more confusion than enlightenment, and which was probably coined by people like Rene Grousset) are not peoples from the steppe, meaning nomads. They have a high culture and a long tradition which are reflected in the writing system and literature, trained aesthetics and a sophisticated state and military constitutions. These could never have been developed in the steppe. Each of the peoples you mentioned have left their mark on the heartland of China. For example, Pulleyblank (THE PEOPLES OF THE STEPPE FRONTIER IN EARLY CHINESE SOURCES, 1998) was able follow the traces of the Avars via the Hephthalites back to the Wuhuans (吳 丸 or 烏桓). The Wuhuans fought on the side of the Wei during the Three Kingdoms Period in 206 AD (Han Shu Book 94 Xiongnu 上) and lived in South of Yangtse River. The more concrete materials from the steppe can be identified and diciphered the more such identifications would be possible. This would finally put the prehistoric genealogy of the Europeans on a more solid basis.

Like

Florin Curta
1 mo ago

There is an elephant in the room, and I must name it. Taking the Shechter Letter and the Letter of King Joseph (both variants) at face value is problematic, to say the least. Some have gone as far as to suggest that they are texts created in al-Andalus by Jews living under Muslim rule, who, for a variety of reasons, wanted to depict a rosy picture of a Jewish kingdom in the East. See Stampfer, Shaul. "Did the Khazars convert to Judaism?" Jewish Social Studies. History, Culture, Society 19 (2013), no. 3: 1-72. I don't necessarily subscribe to such views, but I cannot ignore the fact that there is absolutely nothing in the archaeological record to document the conversion to Judaism and the practice of that religion after that. No synagogues, no tombstones, nothing. See Flerov, Valerii S., and Valentina E. Flerova. "Iudaizm v stepnoi i lesostepnoi Khazarii: problema identifikacii arkheologicheskikh istochnikov." In Khazary, edited by Vladimir Ia. Petrukhin, Wolf Moskovich and Artem M. Fedorchuk, Evrei i slaviane, 16, 185-206. Jerusalem/Moscow: Gesharim/Mosty Kul'tury, 2005. Even the evidence of the Khazar imitation of a dirham with Moses replacing Muhammad in the shahadah has been, IMHO, interpreted wrongly, primarily by Roman Kovalev. In short, this whole thing has been blown out of proportions, for reasons that, as Professor Golden has mentioned below, have to do with nationalism, not with the evidence. One is reminded in this context of the equally misguided attempts to see a Jewish community in Čelarevo (Serbia) during the 8th century, on the basis of (fragments of) bricks with menorah graffiti on them. The situation, in both cases, is (more or less intentionally) simplified to fit a preconceived agenda. When one looks closer, and attempts to do so without any blinders, things are much more complicated--not politically, but in terms of the nature of the evidence.

Like 1

Ha-Sung H . Chung
1 mo ago

Thank you for adressing the content of my paper (you are the first, I must admid). To be honest, I can't quite understand your reasoning. On the one hand you criticize the fact that the letters are taken too literally (at face value), in the next sentence you state that the letters could have been written by people who were not Khazars, meanning they are fakes. If I study a text monument from far in the past I assume that it is genuine one as long as proven otherwise. Every archaeologist, philologist or historian should bring this much respect towards it because a valuable asset has been entrusted to him. I take every word seriously and try to create a textual unity. Then I consider whether any content of the text can be confirmed by any other text monument. I have therefore huge respect for the the Khazar Letters and regret that they have not been dealt with with enough fairness so far. Authors have taken certain passages of the text and made them their political agendas. This happened in the Renaissance as well as in our days. What I found in the letters is amazing. The conditions in northern China, the Eurasian steppe and Central Asia are aptly described, the conversion based on the Torah is convincing, and the relationships with neighboring peoples (Bulgarians, Alans, Russians, Greeks, Arabs) agree with our current knowledge (as far as I have them). As Schleiermacher said: Restauration of old texts have more value than 100 years of historical researches. They are living witnesses of the past.

Like 1

Peter B Golden
1 mo ago

The basic authenticity of Josephs's letter and the Schechter letter has been established by Dunlop, Golb and others. No one doubts that Josephs's letter went through several hands and changes were probably made. The Schechter Letter has its problems as well. These remain points of discussion. As for the lack (so far) of archaeological evidence...Yes, but the problems of Khazar archaeology (suppressed at various times in the Soviet Union, as Pletnëva herself noted) remain. One could similarly ask where are the mosques and churches of Khazaria? All the Muslim geographical literature and Byzantine Notitiae Episcopatuum tell us about the Muslim and Christian communities of Khazaria. Muslims very likely predominated in the Khazar "cities." I find Roman Kovalev's explanation of the Judaized "shahadah" quite convincing. There is a thorough discussion of the multi-staged conversion to Judaism in Alex Feldman's dissertation (Birmingham U.) which will be published, as I understand it, in the near future. Yes, the conversion question has been blown out of proportion by modern scholars, for a variety of reasons (some quite political), but the conversion to Judaism of elements of the Khazar ruling elite - and perhaps some core tribes, seems beyond question.

Like 2

Florin Curta
1 mo ago

There is clear evidence of Muslim cemeteries, if not mosques. See Eduard E. Kravchenko, "Musul'manskoe naselenie srednego techeniia Severskogo Donca i rasprostranenie islama v Vostochnoi Evrope v khazarskoe vremia." In Stepi Evropy v epokhu srednevekov'ia. Khazarskoe vremia. Edited by A. V. Evgelevskii. Vol. 4, 153-86. Donetsk: Izdatel'stvo Donetskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 2005. The problem of the comparison of the archaeological evidence for Islam and Judaism has been addressed pertinently and quite convincingly by Valerii S. Flerov, "Iudaizm, khristianstvo, islam v khazarskom kaganate po arkheologicheskim dannym (kratkii obzor)." Prinosi kăm bălgarskata arkheologiia 8 (2018): 139-45.

Like

Florin Curta
1 mo ago

I don't doubt the conversion of the members of the Khazar elite to Judaism. Nor do I question the authenticity of the Khazar correspondence. Perhaps the author of this paper, upon which I commented, could do a better job of reading and understanding my comment. I actually wrote quite clearly that "I don't necessarily subscribe to such views" (i.e., Stampfer's idea that the correspondence is purely and simply concocted by Andalusi Jews, a mere invention). On the other hand, to "take every word [of the Khazar correspondence] seriously and try to create a textual unity" is a very problematic statement. As Professor Golden put it, Joseph's letter went through many hands and its content (and appearance) was changed many times. There are, after all, clear differences between the short and the long version. So far, I don't know anyone who has explained those differences on the textual basis alone (all other explanations are based on suppositions, not textual criticism). My own position on this matter is somewhere near J. T. Olsson, "Coup d'état, coronation or conversion: some reflections on the adoption of Judaism by the Khazar khaganate." Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society 23 (2013), no. 4, 495-526, another conspicuous omission from this paper's bibliography.

Like

Florin Curta
1 mo ago

Finally, about the dirham imitation with the Judaized shahadah. If that coin was struck as a proclamation of faith, it is at least bizarre that it used Arabic, and not Hebrew script (Hebrew inscriptions on coins struck within the Arab world exist, e.g., Idrisid Morocco, and they reached the lands of the Rus' through the commercial network of the Caliphate). The message is clearly for Jews, not Muslims, who would be quite angry at the alteration of the shahadah. However, the Jews in question must have been able to read the Arabic script, which implies that they could speak the language as well. Could those be the Jews of Khazaria? In my opinion, there was no need to proclaim the conversion to local Jews via the alteration of the shahadah. If one was concerned about announcing to local Jews that the Khazar elite had converted, one would have been in a better position using a message in Hebrew (and with Hebrew script). It is also unlikely that the point of this "joke" was to get the Muslims angry. I am not sure what would have been the point of doing that., given the presence and power of the Khwarazmians. Moreover, one needs to keep in mind that the coin issue was very, very small. So far, only one coin is known, which speaks volumes about the public character (or lack thereof) of the event. IMHO, the coins were for the Radhanites (attested as visiting Khazaria in Ibn Khurdadbih's Book of Routes and Kingdoms), not for the Jews of Khazaria or for the Khazar converts.

Like

Peter B Golden
1 mo ago

The dirham was the international currency of the Silk Road and beyond, cf. the large finds in the Northern lands. The use of Arabic, understood by the bulk of the traders, makes sense. You raise a good point, as have others, that it appears to have been issued only in 837/838, along with other dirhams that have Türk tamghas on them or the inscription ard-al-khazar ("land of the Khazars"). Obviously, something was going on and the Khazars were proclaiming it.. Unfortunately, we know little of Khazar internal history and can only speculate. I take the "coup theory" cum grano salis." It was concocted by Artamonov (coached by Gumilev), who had an anti-Semitic agenda and it became the standard Soviet line. Yes, the Radhaniyya were important traders across Eurasia and passed through Atil/Etil. We have absolutely no idea if they played a role in the conversion. They were soon replaced by the Rus (at least as far as Khazaria was concerned) and we see this in Ibn Khurdadbeh, whose "Book of Routes and Kingdom underwent two editions, one in the 840s and the final one in 885 or so. He uses almost identical language to describe them. Between the 840s and 885, the Rus, it would appear, supplanted the Radhaniyya.

Like 1

Florin Curta
1 mo ago

That the dirham with the Judaized shahadah was found in Gotland can only mean that after being struck, it was used somewhere in Khazaria (probably in Itil) for a market exchange. Whoever acquired it in the first place (either asking to be struck at the qaganal mint, or through yet another exchange), paid with that dirham for some commodity coming from the north--furs, slaves, wax or the like. As a consequence, the coin moved with the last recipient to the north. The find spot has absolutely no relevance for the interpretation of the Judaized shahadah and **that** is where I think Roman Kovalev was wrong.

Like

Florin Curta
1 mo ago

As for Artamonov's anti-Semitic reasons, this is the first time I learn/read about such an idea. What we know about Artamonov speaks to the contrary, actually. And I am not the only one to maintain that. See, for details, the excellent book of Viktor A. Shnirel'man, The Myth of the Khazars and Intellectual Antisemitism in Russia, 1970s-1990s (Jerusalem Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2002). There is also a thorough investigation of the archives, including Artamonov's correspondence, in Nataliia Medvedenko, Istoriia i arkheologiia khazarskogo kaganata v issledovanii M. I. Artamonova (Voronezh: Istoki, 2006). I cannot find anything about Artamonov's anti-Semitism linked to the "coup theory" in that book. The same goes for Lev S. Klein, Soviet Archaeology. Schools, Trends, and

History (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). Be that as it may, any serious study of Artamonov's work shows that, at least until his (forced) self-critique in the wake of his denunciation in Pravda, he did not entertain any such thoughts. I also fail to see how Artamonov could have been coached by Gumilev, who was 14 years his junior. Boy, Gumilev must have been a really precocious kid in 1936, when Ocherki drevneishei istorii khazar was first published...

Like 1

Peter B Golden
1 mo ago

Of course, Gumilev played no role in Artamonov's (1936) 1937 book. Rather, it is in his magnum opus История хазар (1962) that these views views are spelled out in his Conclusion: " Но принятие иудейской религии было для них роковым шагом. С этого времени был потерян контакт правительства с народом и на смену развития скотоводства и земледелия наступила эпоха посреднической торговли и паразитического обогащения правящей верхушки. Новое правительство справедливо не верило своему народу и держалось на копьях мусульманской гвардии. Талмудическая образованность не затрагивала массы, оставаясь привилегией немногих. С этого времени роль Хазарского каганата стала резко отрицательной... Все богатство накопленное иудейскими купцами в Итиле, не могло купить сердец заселявших лесостепи славян, степняков Причерноморья - печенегов, кочевников зауральской равнины - гузов... Данлоп, собиравшийся написать историю иудейских хазар, не понял, какую коварную роль сыграло иудейство с Хазарским государством" etc. He also claims that хазары также насильственно утверждали в качестве государственной религии иудейство for which we have no evidence. He dismisses Khazar religious tolerance as a myth (willfully ignoring what the Arab historians have to say about their religious tolerance). The Khazars were not exceptional in this. Religious tolerance was well known among many of the nomadic polities of Eurasia. As for Gumilev, he notes him as helping him with the Türks, but Gumilev's influence is felt in many other aspects of his work.

Unlike 3

Israel Palchan
1 mo ago

Whoever read this Artamonovs book understand that this "Conclusion" is not connected at all to presented inside the text. Seems that it was not written by the author but may be by the redactor or publisher. And even at that case it was kind of unbelievable success that this book has been permitted for publishing . Gumilev oppositive to Artamonove uses antisemitic hate widely.

Unlike 1

Mohammad Mushfequr Rahman
1 mo ago

relevant https://www.academia.edu/61749668/Anti_Zionism_is_NOT_anti_Jew_or_anti_Judaism

Like

Peter B Golden
1 mo ago

Zionism is simply Jewish nationalism, an expression of Jewish peoplehood, the same as other nationalisms (English, French, German, Arab et al.). If you deny one people the right to express nationalism, then you should deny that same right to others who do the same. One cannot have one standard for one people and another standard for everyone else. In some quarters, Khazar Studies veer off - for political reasons - into anti-Zionism and in essence Judeophobia.

Unlike 4

Florin Curta
1 mo ago

One needs to keep in mind that Shlomo Sand's book published 11 years ago was (and perhaps still is) one of the most popular books in history ever published in Israel. There is a desire to make the Khazars (genuine) Jews, and that is not only because of Israeli nationalism. The very existence of the state of Israel may be questioned if one truly believes that the Jews are Khazars. Nobody seems to have been troubled by the little detail that in order for that idea to be accepted, one would have to accept also that the entire population of the Khazar qaganate had to convert to Judaism. Moreover, one would have to demonstrate also a mass migration from the steppe lands north of the Caspian and Black Seas to Central and, later, Western Europe. There is simply no evidence of any of that whatsoever.

Unlike 3

Peter B Golden
1 mo ago

The "disappearance" of the Khazars remains an interesting problem. Normally, in the steppe world, important groupings (and the Khazars as one of the longest-lived Turkic states in the western steppe zone were certainly important), after their dissolution as polities or tribal unions, leave traces in clan names etc. For example the name "Qïpchaq" is widely found among later Turkic peoples. A quick look at Р.Г. Кузеев, Происхождение башкирского народа. Этнический состав, история расселения (Москва, 1974) provides ample evidence of this - and this is just one example. We do not find the name "Khazar"/Qazar among the clan or tribal names of later Turkic peoples. Why? No one has come up with an answer thus far. The Jews of Rus' probably came from the older Jewish communities in the Crimea, Taman Peninsula and from Byzantium (and perhaps elsewhere). The flight of Jews from Byzantium to Khazaria (persecutions under Romanos Lekapenos, d. 948) is noted in the sources. Ashkenazi Jewish origins are sought in Yiddish-speaking Jewish groups moving in from the west and ultimately absorbing Slavic-speaking Jews long resident in Belarus' and Ukraine. The latter, most probably, stem from Jewish communities already attested in pre-Mongol Rus' (e.g. in Kiev). In light of the "Kievan Letter" from the Cairo Genizah, the Kievan Jewish community had Khazar elements (or so Pritsak maintained). Sand's book had a political agenda (and said as much). It was a political diatribe, with "scholarly" embellishments. A far more scholarly treatment of this is found in Paul Wexler's magnum opus, Silk Road Linguistics. The birth of Yiddish and the multiethnic Jewish peoples on the Silk Roads, 9-13th centuries (Wiesbaden 2021) in some 1412 pages! Basically, it is a detailed and expanded treatment of his "relexification" theory already presented in some earlier studies. Wexler is an excellent linguist, but his theory is far-fetched. It is often conveniently forgotten that Ashkenazi Jews are not a majority in Israel. The Sephardic and Mizrahi communities outnumber them (there is now about 35% "intermarriage" rate between them). The best reconstruction of the origins of the Ashkenazi Jews can be found in Alexander Beider, Origins of Yiddish Dialects (Oxford, 2015), esp. in the section "Origins of Ashkenazic Jewry," pp. 525-567. Part of it was previewed in his "Язык, имена и фамилии евреев Восточной Европы: существует ли хазарский след?" in Хазары: миф и история, под ред. А.К. Аликберова и др. (Москва-Иерусалим, 2010): 350-373.

Like 2

Albert Kaganovitch
1 mo ago

Hi Peter, Sorry for off topic. What do you think about the opinion that some of the Kumyks are one of the Khazars fragments? A. Kadyrov wrote: "Хазарские родо-племенные группы БАРШИЛИ (БАРСИЛЫ), СЕМЕНДЕР , ТАРГУ ,ДЖАНДАР (от джандар-хазар),ЭНДИРЕЙ (от ВЕНЕНДЕР)сохранились среди кумыков Дагестана. Даргинцы и поныне называют южных кумыков ДЖАНДАР-по имени хазарского племени чдар-хазар 6-8 веков севернеее Дербента.Однако кумыкские АСЫ и АС-ТАРГУ,ТАРК-АСЫ тоже могут быть хазарскими АСАМИ,принимавшими участие в антиправительственном восстании 9 века.АСЫ державы УСУНЬ на Алтае и Балхаше 2 века до н.э.,АСЫ-АСПУРГИАНЕ Кавказа 2-1 вв.до н.э.,АСЫ\АЗЫ Тюркского каганата--- именно тюркские племена,а не индо-иранцы

осетины.Ироно-дигорский вариант названия балкар и карачаев АС и АССИАГ сохранил старую традицию. Этноним АС может быть древнейшим названием всех тюрков Евразии давно до степных каганатов,о чем повествуют и руны Скандинавии,куда с "земель Тюркаленда переселились АСЫ Одина" скандинавских саг.(Статьи Тахира Кангаура).Рунические надписи Хумаринского городища в Карачаево-Черкесии,Саркела и Семикаракорского городища,Таргу и Дербента говорят о близости хазаро-булгарских языков Хазарии нынешним кумыкскому,балкаро-карачаевскому и крымско-татарскому языкам,а не чувашскому." And another person writes also about connections between Kumyks and Khazars
http://kumukia.ru/?id=1140

Like

Florin Curta
1 mo ago

I'm afraid the only reason for calling it Kievan Letter and to attach that document attesting the existence of a Jewish community in town is to read Q(U)WWB as Kiev. Not everybody agrees with that reading, and there is **nothing** else in the text to help with the location, not even the runic inscription One wishes K'naan would be mentioned somewhere . As for the supposed Khazar stamp of approval that the runic inscription, by a different hand, indicates, I wonder if there was any authority next to Kiev (Sviatoslav's whereabouts) to do such a thing, ca. 960. But I digress...

Like

Peter B Golden
1 mo ago

Hi Albert, Yes, a number of scholars have suggested that Kumyk (or Karachay-Balkar for that matter) may descend from the Khazars. Turkologically speaking, Kumyk (Qumuq) and Karachay-Balkar (Qarachay-Malqar) are Cuman-Qïpchaq Turkic languages. Whether they were "Cumanized" peoples of perhaps Alano-As (Osetin) origin is a possibility. The Karachay use the word "Alan" as a form of address. In addition to Qarachaylï, they also use the name Tawlu ("mountaineer"). Lots of room for speculation, not much data that is not relatively recent. The names for the days of the week in Karachay show Christian and Judaic influences (see my "Days of the Week in Turkic: Notes on the Cuman-Qıpčaq Pattern" Acta Orientalia Hungarica, 48/3 (1995): 363-375, for details). The Turkic languages spoken in Khazaria were variants of East Old Turkic (often termed "Common Turkic" - Cuman-Qïpchaq fits under that general heading) and West Old Turkic (Oghuric/Bulgharic, surviving today only in Chuvash). We still cannot pinpoint precisely where Khazar fits in within Turkic. We are most probably dealing with an East Old Turkic language spoken by the ruling group, at least initially, and West Old Turkic/Bulgharic spoken by at least some of the subject tribes. The names mentioned by

Kadyrbaev are largely known as toponyms. Some may ultimately go back to clan or tribal names, but in the sources they appear as place-names. Barshaliyya etc. may be connected with Bersil, a name (anthroponym or tribal name?) noted in the Tes and Terkhin inscriptions. Kliashtornyi has suggested that the Khazars are noted as the Qasar (otherwise known as an Uyghur tribe) in the inscriptions which also note the Evdi, Bersil, Qadïr (Tes) or Qadïr, Qasar, Evdi, Bersil, Yatïz, Oghuz (Terkhin). According to him, these Qasars fled and ultimately formed the Qazar/Khazar people. The inscriptions are damaged and open to a number of readings. This is all speculative - and there has been no shortage of speculations on Khazar origins.

Like 3

Peter B Golden
1 mo ago

Florin, the form is קייוב (Qiyob[v] and can be compared with other renderings of Kiev in medieval Hebrew texts (as Golb does), Const. Porph. has Κιοάβα, Arabic acounts (e.g. al-Iṣṭakhrī, Ibn Ḥawqal) have كويابة Kūyāba. It is not a leap of faith to see Qiyov within that same group denoting Kiev. The interesting question that has been raised (actually there are lots of questions) is whether the letter was from a Jewish community in Kiev or to a Jewish community in Kiev. The mention of the "Jewish Gates" (Жидовьскые ворота) in mid-12th century Kiev points to the presence of a Jewish community there. Whether it dates back to the Khazar era cannot be determined on the basis of the data we have. In 986, "Khazar Jews" (жидове козарьстии) are noted as coming to Vladimir I in the aftermath of Volga Bulgarian and Western Christian attempts to convert him to offer him their faith. The Old Rus' text does not make clear where they came from (Khazaria? Kiev? or elsewhere).

Like 2

Florin Curta
1 mo ago

Peter, the name of the Jewish Gate in Kiev is no indication of a Jewish community in Kiev (although the possibility of one existing is of course to be kept in mind). First, the gate was named that way after the one in Constantinople (much like the Golden Gate used the same model). Second, there is no indication in Rus' sources of a Jewish community in Kiev until very, very late, although there is mention of "Jews" (to be understood as people, or as the quarter of the city named after them). I'm afraid there were no Khazar Jews by 986, and the mention of the жидове козарьстии in PVL is no confirmation of the existence of a Jewish community among the Khazars (who were not in existence as a polity by that time), much less of one in Kiev. Aleksandr Kulik has dealt with those problems in a pretty thorough fashion: Kulik, Aleksandr. "Evrei Drevnei Rusi: istochniki i istoricheskaia

rekonstrukciia." In Istoriia evreiskogo naroda v Rossii. I. Ot drevnosti do rannego novogo vremeni. Edited by Aleksandr Kulik, 189-213 Jerusalem/Moscow: Gesharim/Mosty kul'tury, 2010.

Like

Florin Curta
1 mo ago

IMHO, the earliest evidence of a Jewish community (as opposed to just "Jews") in Kiev cannot be dated before 1100--the responsum in Eliezer ben Nathan's (Raavan's) Even h'ezer. A learned man named Moses of Kiev is mentioned as student of Rabbeinu Tam, a 12th-century Tosafist.

Like

Mohammad Mushfequr Rahman
1 mo ago

Jewish nationalism is a contradiction of term. Jews cannot have a nation. FORBIDDEN! But if you throw away Bible and God and consider Jews as only some ethnic people then perhaps they can claim a nationahood based on ethnicity but the question is where should this nation be? The best place is in Europe as Europe has persecuted Jews most

Like

Osman Karatay
3 mos ago

Dear all, Ethnicity of the Khazars is clear enough I think. They are frankly described as of Turkic stock, a combination of mainly Sabir/Suvar ethnie and a Kök Türk administrative layer, by almost all medieval sources, headed by the Reply of the Qagan Joseph. Chinese sources also classify them under the name Turk, as you know. The Cambridge Document explains how a Jewish group migrated to Daghestan and how they were almost integrated with the local Turkic entity. So, the question should be not ... Read More

Unlike 7

Ha-Sung H . Chung
3 mos ago

Thank you for joining. It's a great honor.

Like 1

Peter B Golden
3 mos ago

Osman Karatay is completely correct. Khazar DNA evidence is, at present, meager and only has begun to be discussed. What has appeared thus far indicates that they are Turkic. The so-called theory that the Ashkenazi Jews are descendants of the Khazars lacks evidence. Elhaik's flawed DNA deductions, none of it based on actual Khazar DNA, have been dismissed by serious people in the field. The Ashkenazi Jews have their origins in the Middle East, with some admixture from "host" populations in the areas of their diaspora settlement. The Khazar "theory" has been politicized for use in the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Unlike 4

Israel Palchan
3 mos ago

However the ancient Arabic historians including (Al Makdasi) wrote about two different ethnics of Khazars: one described as having black hair and other the blond. Also they described having different body appearance. The blond are high and strong people, comparing to lower high and thinner of black hair Khazars. It seems as possible to see one of these ethical bases as Slavic and the second as Turkish tribe (Ashine tribe as appear in written sources). The continuance of agriculture in Khazar areas of North Caucasus to Volga (Itil) area is found by Russian archeologies at last years and may be serves as a base factor in many Russian cities that began to be known to history immediately after Khazars times. Thats why for my opinion it is not right to speak about Khazar's ethnicity without Slavic"s one. Also great amount of language borrowings from Hebrew to Slavic-Russian language support the idea that Khazar's Slavic people have learned Hebrew may be for religious or administrate purposes.

Unlike 1

Simon Berger
3 mos ago

The division between White Khazars and Black Khazars is reported by al-Istakhri and Ibn Hawqal, not Muqaddasi, to the best of my knowledge. Ibn Hawqal writes that the king [the beg] of the Khazars

resides in the western part of the capital with his retinue, his army and the "pure Khazars" الخلّص الخزر (ed. Kramers, II, pp. 392-3; tr. II, p. 383). Further on he writes that there are two types of Khazars: the Qara Khazars [Black Khazars], who have a dark complexion, and the others who have white skin (II, p. 394; tr. II, p. 385). This elaboration on the skin colour of the two types of Khazars is almost certainly a gloss added by the author to an information he did not understand, thinking that black and white refer to distinctive features. The Qara Khazars are most likely the qara bodun, the common "black" people, as opposed to the Aq Khazars [the White Khazars], i.e. the nobility, whose designation is translated into Arabic as الخلّص الخزر. It would make sense that the western part of the capital was the residence of the ruler, his court, his army, and the nobility, while the eastern part would be reserved for the plebs. The expression "pure Khazars" could also be interpreted as "Khazars proper", in the sense that it is the nobles who really carry the Khazar political identity, while the mass of subjects would be Khazars by assimilation. The opposition between the two types of Khazars is not ethnic but social.

Unlike 2

Ha-Sung H . Chung
3 mos ago

I agree with you in full that the diversion of the Khazars is not ethnic but social. The caste order seems to be a general peculiarity of the Yi peoples. This system was probably established in the slave system of the Shang era. The Xia were the masters, the Yi peoples the slaves. The Yi peoples later adopted this system. Wherever they overtook power, they divided the population into classes and dressed them accordingly. The upper class mostly wore white clothes, the others were of different colors. Today we call such a system a feudal order. Among the Xiongnus in the Jin (晉) period, the Jin Shu (晉書) reports that the first 16 state offices of the Xiongnus could only be held by the immediate sons of the Chanyu (皆用單于 親子弟也, Jin Shu 晉書 Book 97, 列傳 第, 四夷, 北狄). About the Korean state of Shilla we read in the "Treatise on the History of the East" (東史綱 目) of An Chung Bok (安鼎福) published in 1712 that the members of the royal clans were called "sacred bones (聖骨)". Members of the current royal family were called "real bones (眞 骨)" or "first bones", the others "second bones". The state offices of the rank 1 to 5 were only occupied by the real bones. The real bones did not marry the women of the second bones, if they did, these women were only recognized as concubines (妾媵) (An Chung Bok (安鼎福), Treatise on the History of the East 東史綱目, 1712, Book 1, 2nd part, AD 32). The Rouran also had a special class that formed the nobility. As with the Xiongnus, these nobles were called Dachen. They received the highest posts in the military directly from the Khagan. When these peoples came to Europe as Sarmatians, Alans, Huns and Avars, they brought this feudal order with them. Marcellinus reports about free and unfree Sarmatians (Res Gestae, 29, 6), the Frankish order knew no less than 9 classes: the nobility, the free, the optimates, the clergy, the knights, the the lessfree, the unfree, the lawless and dishonorable, guests and Jews.

Like

Israel Palchan
3 mos ago

The social diversion theory for Khazars indeed has been published yet . But , first it does not explain the al-Istakhri and Ibn Hawqal direct evidences about Khazars view. Second it doesn't explain Muqaddasi evidence that Khazars look as Slavic people and also if Khazars didn't include slavic ethnicity where from Russian Slavic cities were formed in 10 century and why there are so many Hebrew borrowings in Russian Language. There is one basic fact- two big ethnicities continue after Khazars: Russian Slavics basing on agriculture inherited from Khazars and semi nomadic Turks. The story tells that Khazars invited Kahan's tribe of Ashine to rule them. So from two possibilities the conclusion have to identify them as Slavic tribes. Just to compare almost same story occurs to North Russian tribes, sure Slavic origin, 3-4 hundred years later. This time they invite Varyagian leader Ruric to rule them. And later they choose German knight family for the same purpose .

Like

Osman Karatay
2 mos ago

Thanks dear Prof. Golden. The black and white case is an almost unexceptional usage within Turkic tribal unions, the white denoting to the original and/or lesser group, and sometimes to the upper stratum as in the Khazars, and the black component implies those joining later or constituting the greater part, thus mostly 'common people'. The latest is also what we see in Khazaria. It influenced also the east Slavic entity giving birth to the Belorus name. Sometimes the concepts 'inner' and 'outer' are also used respectively for 'white' and 'black'.

Like 2

Alex M Feldman
2 mos ago

Thank you Dr. Golden and Dr. Karatay. The only evidence for the "Khazar-Ashkenazi descent" theory belongs to the fevered conspiracy theories of the heirs of Koestler. There's no archaeological evidence to support it; the overwhelming weight of textual and genetic evidence points in the opposite direction, and linguistic/toponymic evidence alone doesn't cut it. The theories and flawed methods of Elhaik and Wexler have been thoroughly debunked but they persist for the same reasons that people continue to believe in "stop the steal." Pseudoscience has no place beside real science.

Like 2

Ha-Sung H . Chung
2 mos ago

Dear Alex Feldman, as a third party in the political Israelite-Palestinian discussion, I do not agree with the sentence that the Khazar-Ashkenazi decent theory is a conspiracy theory. I haven't found a better answer for the question where the Ashkenazi Jews have come from until now. The “Rhineland hypothesis” is inconclusive, to say the least. The several million Jews in Eastern Europe and Russia can actually only come from Khazaria. The recent archaeological investigations, in particular finds in Kharzars graves in Russia, confirm in my opinion the Khazar-Ashkenazi decent theory. These tombs point to the east (Central Asia, even Far East) rather than to the west (Rome, Spain). And it is Koestler’s credit that Khazaria has become, at least, focus of interest for scholars who are interested in the Israelites’ history. I hold indisputably so far Koestler’s assertion - that in the Early and High Middle Ages there were hardly any Jews in Western Europe; - That the Orthodox Judaism of today very much bears the characteristics of the Karaits, who were widespread among the Jews in the regions between Crimea and Persia in the preislamic era.

Like

Israel Palchan
2 mos ago

This view should follow to conclusion that in Khazar world lived significant number of semitic Jews. That is hoping that DNA research supports the same grounds for Ashkenazi Jews and Meadle East population such as Kurds as I hear. It doesn't mean that originally Khazars were Semits. But it can support explanation for Khazars religion preferences. Actually I prefer to see slavic population as one of two origins for Khazars . and Being Slavic Language wide spoken in the area of Khazars support this view. Big number of Language Hebrew borrowings to Russian can not be explained by contact of small Jewish population in Kiev with Christian slavs beginning from Kiev Russia. Prolonged and wide contacts of slavs population in Khazars times with Jews at same area and religion explain them. Persian impeir that inherited the Babel and Assirian world was be able and responsible for existence wide contacts of different ethnicities. As well as ancient Roma that put Irod′s granchildren or grand grandchildren to rule Armenian state in South Caucasus . Long time before Khazars, but very near geographically.

Unlike 1

Ha-Sung H . Chung
2 mos ago

Dear Israel, Thank you for sharing your deep thoughts. I find it particularly interesting that the Slavs were one of the two groups of the Khazars. This agrees with the thesis in my paper that the Khazsars met aborigins in Dagestan. These people were called Tiele (铁勒) in Chinese sources. The Tiele may actually have been the Slavs (Tiele = Shile = Slav). They were slaves of the Bulgarians at that time (actually the term sclaveni was used by Roman authors (Prokopios of Caesarea for example) as a name of certain people in the eastern frontier territory). Regarding the origin and composition of the Russians and the Russian people I would like to refer to Vernadzky who identified the ruling class of the Russians with the Roxalans. This name already indicates the Israelite origin. Rox = Rosh (head)+ Alan = Aran (we in Chinese and Korean (Ari, Uri), thus meaning “our leaders”. The Alans were probably the slaves (ante-people) of the Russians. In my opinion this two-fold division of people is a typical characteristic of all peoples who emigrated from China. They had a strict caste system. The ruling class took the lower class with them as farmers and craftsmen, as usuary stock, so to speak. I think the Romans met these groups among the Alans and from the name of this group (Sclav) the term slave was formed. Something similar also happens in Asia. Farmers are called Nongbu in Korean, originally the Nongs were the name of a people in southern China. The nongs, or hmongs, still exist today. Where does the name Slav come from? I think this name is derived from the name of the Israelite family name Shelah שֵׁלָה, son of Judah (Numbers 26, 20). This family name was famous and widespread in Asia. So the name Shi Le (石, 274 to 333) who during the 16-state period founded the Later Zhao (後 趙, 319–351) with the capital in today's Xingtai, Hebei. Shilla (新 羅, 신라) which was an ancient Korean state with long history (57 BC to 654).

Like 1

Florin Curta
1 mo ago

The migration of Jews (Khazars or not) from Eastern to Central and Western Europe should have left some serious traces in both written and archaeological sources. There is absolutely no evidence of that. The most recent discussion of the migratory patterns of the Jewish population is Michael Toch, “Demography and migrations,” in The Middle Ages: the Christian World, edited by Robert Chazan, The Cambridge History of Judaism, 6 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), pp. 335-356. Also, based on the serious study of religious and ritual practices, the idea has recently been put forward that the Jews of medieval Rus' (at least until the Mongol invasion of 1241) originated in Byzantium. There is actually some evidence in the Cairo Genizah for that. See Kulik, Aleksandr. "Evrei Drevnei Rusi: istochniki i istoricheskaia rekonstrukciia." Ruthenica 7 (2008): 52-70. Meanwhile, all the existing evidence (and there is a lot of that) shows that none of the Jewish communities in 11th- to 13th-century Poland and Hungary originated in Rus'. So much for the Khazar origin of the Jews in East Central Europe.

Like 2

Marcel Erdal
2 mos ago

There is no connection between the Germanic (and mostly Scandinavian) runes and the similar-looking writing system of the Early Turks. These latter were called "runes" because the Fins, who were banished to Siberia by the Russians and came across the inscriptions there, at first thought they might be the original writing of some Finno-Ugrians, their relatives. They sent them to Vilhelm Thomsen, who had publications concerning early Finnish, but he found out that they were actually Turkic.

Like 2

Ha-Sung H . Chung
2 mos ago

With all due respect, the correlation between Old Turkish runic scripts, especially the inscriptions from Orkhon and Yenisei, and Germanic runic scripts, especially the Futhark, cannot be overlooked. 1. It is an alphabetical system. That already is amazing. 2. They are read from right to left (in most cases). Germanic and Turkish peoples certainly had historical contact points, at least during the migration period, if one considers the Gök-Turks to be part of the Xiongnus / Huns. In any case, it is said in Fredegar about the origin of the Franks that their ancestors split into two parts on the Danube. One part emigrated to the west and became Franks, the remaining part became Turks (Ceptum quidem, sed inperfectum opus remansit. Residua eorum pars, que super litore Danuvii remanserat, elietum a se Torcoth nomen regem, per quem ibique vocati sunt Turchi; et per Francionem hii alii vacati sunt Franci. Multis post peroribus cum ducibus externas domnationis semper negantes." Fredegarii et Aliorum Chronica, 3.2, S. 93.). By the way, it was V. Thomson who stated that the Sogdian alphabet and the Old Turkish runes had one thing in common: that they were not derived from the Greek alphabet but from the Aramaic alphabet.

Like 1

Huaan Chang
2 mos ago

The Sauromatians borrowed Gothic Runic Alphabets to develop their Runic letters; the Turks then borrowed Sauromatian Runic Alphabets to create their Runic script after they conquered the Sauromatian state in Xinjiang in 551 CE. This makes Sauromatian Runic Alphabets the middle link between Gothic Runic Alphabets and Turkic Runic Runic Script. It should be noted that it is not

precise to name Turkic Runic (or Orkhon) Script as Turkic Orkhon-Yenesei Script, as suggested by some linguists; Yenesei Script is Sauromatian Runic Script.

Like

Huaan Chang
2 mos ago

In the Minusinsk Basin, southern Siberia, and the Lena River and the Baikal Lake in eastern Siberia, stone inscriptions similar to Turkic Orkhon Runic script or Gothic Runic alphabets have been found on the rock walls of valleys. In addition, more than ten similar inscriptions have also been found in Semirechye. Most of them appear in the upper reach of the Talas River in today's Republic of Kyrgyzstan except one found on the shore of Lake Issyk-Kul. The artifacts unearthed from the kurgans in Issyk (Kazakhstan) north of Lake Baikal, Mongolia, and Inner Mongolia also have similar Runic inscriptions (Figure 95). Among these inscriptions, the ones in Semirechye and Yenisei (Minusink) are very similar in the characteristics of the alphabets and contents but are significantly different from the Turkic Orkhon inscriptions and, in particular, the Selenge inscriptions , belonging to Uyghur Khaganate. Some scholars think the Runic inscriptions in the mountain area of Semirechye should be relics of the Western Turks, and their shape is older than the Orkhon Rune. They think "this is most likely the place where the Aramaic alphabet was adopted into the Turkic language and where the Turkic Runic alphabets first appeared before they were in widespread use from here to the east." However, the preceding speculation may have been derived, not from facts, but from the discovery that the Semirechye area was once the king court of the Western Turks. After a long integration, the differences in languages and customs between Eastern Turks and Western Turks should be rather limited. If the Semirechye Runic inscriptions were relics of the Western Turks, and the Orkhon Runic inscriptions were an impact of its eastward spread, then they should be very similar in characteristics and contents. However, as the Semirechye Runic inscriptions are dissimilar to the Orkhon Runic inscriptions, this could not be the case. The Runic inscriptions in the Semirechye region should be the relics left by the people of the Ko-ch Empire people when they escaped to Hephthalites to seek refuge between 516 CE and 521 CE. The Sauromatians established the Ko-ch Empire in northern Xinjiang in 487 CE by the tribes that migrated from the Altai Steppes and the Minusinsk Basin. These nomads were descendants of the Sauromatians who migrated to Siberia from Ukraine in the mid-4th century CE. Comparing the life style and artifacts excavated from the Altai and the Minusinsk regions with those from Xinjiang we found many similarities not in their way of life as well as in artifact iconography. Metallurgy in the two locales was also analogous in respect to the method of casting and forging technologies. Tools and shapes of accessories were comparable, and the shape and decorations on the ceramics were virtually identical. All these parallels indicate that the people in the Altai Steppe and the Minusinsk Basin maintained a near identical culture as those of the Semirechye region. Naturally, the features of their alphabets and the contents of the inscriptions are very similar. This explains why the Semirechye Runic inscriptions and Yenisei Runic inscriptions are allied. The Rune they used must be designated the Sauromatian Script. Since Turkic linguists worldwide are not aware

of the Sauromatian Rune, they have speculated that Turkic Orkhon Rune is derived from the Aramatic-Sogdia Letters (Figure 96), but the basic forms and the lines of the two scripts are quite different. Danish linguist V. L. Thomsen (1842-1927), who successfully deciphered Orkhon Runes, has also found that there are 15 Orkhon Runic symbols not found in the Aramaic-Sogdia Letters. This precludes that fact that Turkic Rune was derived from Aramaic-Sogdia.

Like

Ha-Sung H . Chung
1 mo ago

A story about the Frankish King Chilperic I (561-567) who tried to smuggle 4 letters from the alphabet of his ancestors into Latin, attests to the fact that the Franks had their own script which was different from the Latin or Greek alphabet. Gregor von Tours reports on this incident in Historien, Kirchliche Geschichte der Franken, historia Francorum, V, 45, p. 282. These letters were part of the Franconian runic alphabet. Gregor von Tours was able to successfully repel this attempt. The Korean King Sejong, on the other hand, successfully introduced the Korean alphabet against vehement opposition from his subordinates in 1443. They were of the opinion that a phonetic script would be superfluous. The Chinese characters would be sufficient and necessary to preserve the cultural heritage. King Sejong argued that the ancestors of the Koreans used this phonetic script in ancient times, he did not reinvent it. The Korean alphabet can also be derived from the Old Hebrew-Aramaic alphabet.》。 The Annals of the Joseon Dynasty (朝鮮王朝實錄, 조선왕조실록), 世宗莊憲大王實錄卷第一百二終 , 1443, 12. Month 30. Day.

Like

Marcel Erdal
2 mos ago

Altheim, whom you quote, had no knowledge whatsoever about the language of the Bulgars, the Huns or the Khazars, or about the writing systems which they used. Concerning the language of the Khazars, see also Marcel Erdal, 'The Khazar language'. pp. 75-108 in: Peter B. Golden, Haggai Ben-Shammai & András Roná-Tas (eds.) The World of the Khazars: New Perspectives. Selected Papers from the Jerusalem 1999 International Khazar Colloquium hosted by the Ben Zvi Institute. Leiden, Brill, 2007.

Unlike 3

Ha-Sung H . Chung
2 mos ago

Dear Professor Marcel Erdal, thank you for your valuable comment for which I feel very honored. Whether Altheim has knowledge about the language of the Bulgars, the Huns or the Khazars, or about the writing systems which they used or not, I am sure that you are in a better position to judge than me, who I am a real layman in this regard. However, my reference to him only related to the written monuments that Altheim examined in the work I cited. His statements made, however, perfect sense to me. And above all: I haven't found any other palaeographic study so far except this one that includes a comparative and generic analysis of the Sogdian, Gök-Turkish, Hunnic and Bulgarian rune scripts. Of course, his study is rudimentary and sketchy. But he had a lot less material than we have today. I would, of course, be grateful for any information you may have about recent studies in this regard. From his study I took that the runic script on the objects of the treasure of Nagyszentmiklós can be derived directly from the ancient Hebrew-Aramaic alphabet, thus skipping the Greek alphabet. Recent palaeographic studies on Germanic runes come to similar conclusions (for instance Theo Vennemann, Germanische Runen und phönizisches Alphabet, Sprachwissenschaft Jahrgang 2006 Nr. 31, S. 367-429). . These studies comply with my thesis that the Israelites took the old Hebrew-Aramaic alphabet with them to Asia so that the old Turkish runes, Sogdian alphabet, Germanic runes, and Korean alphabet were developed from this alphabet, i.e. skipping the Greek alphabet.

Like

Chris Blake
2 mos ago

Some observations or questions: 1. Has the original letter or pieces of it survived from 1577? Or is the printed version the only surviving text? 2. Where was it found - a synagogue or church? Were there other documents and if so have any of these survived? 3. If only the 1577 printed text has survived how is the original text datable to about 960? 4. I have checked out the interactions between the Rus and Byzantium in Medieval Russia: a Source Book, Basil Dmytryshyn, 1966 and Early Centuries of Russian History, B Rybakov, 1965 and cannot find any reference to a Rus Oleg interacting with a Byzantine Romanus. The death of first Oleg is dated by the Russian Primary chronicle to 912 (actually to Greek years of the World - but equivalent to that year AD); there is a second Oleg - who appears to have been a rumbustious pirate and general mayhem maker who begins to be referred to (not as king) about 1073. The first Oleg precedes the 1st Romanus Lecapenus by 8 years - the second follows Romanus Diogenes - but not as king of Russia but as an aspirant to the throne of Chernigov by two years. 5. This highlights the importance of the date of the text - if it is truly written in 960 the second Oleg and the last two Romani cannot be linked to the text. 6. If there is any sort of error in early Russian chronology it is possible that the first Oleg and Romanus Lecapenus were contemporary - however the sources for this Oleg and indeed Rurik are written down much later (by about two centuries). 7. The Russian Primary chronicle gives a similar account of the conversion of Vladimir I The Saint to Orthodox Christianity. This Grand Prince sends missions to both the Holy Roman Empire and the Byzantine Empire and allegedly made a decision based upon their ceremonial and creed. 8.

This opens up the possibility that the letter contains a topos - quite a common one in Indian literature, where Buddhist, Jaina and Hindu texts portray the three religions being quizzed by a kings or holding a debate before the king who decides in favour of the most convincing argument. In all of these cases the decision is always in favour of the faith of the author of the text! Most of them are not strictly speaking historical but ontological - i.e. they give a plausible explanation for why that part of India is Buddhist or Hindu. The same may be true of the Russian account of its orthodoxy. 8. I cannot comment upon the references to Chinese texts, accept to note that the problems of equating the geographic and ethnic terms in Mandarin texts with those used in classical and Islamic, is discussed and explained at some length in Mounted Archers, Laszlo Torday, 1997. One problem is trying to establish what was written in the earliest versions of each text, which were often re-edited and additional information added as Chinese knowledge of the western world increased. The other is that while the Mandarin signs have remained the same the Chinese spoken language (by which I think he means the spoken language of northern China) has changed significantly since the Spring and Autumn Period, the Period of Waring States or the Chin and Han Empires.

Unlike 1

Ha-Sung H . Chung
2 mos ago

I am sure we have experts among us to answer your good questions to the best satisfaction. As to the question regarding the pronounciation of Old Chinese scripts Karlgren already remarked that Korean and Cantonese reading of today is nearer to the Old Chinese pronounciation than Mandarin.

Like

Dr.Klaus Singethan
2 mos ago

dr.klaus israel has the meaning god fights,god rules and was given by jabbob (GOD) to jakob it was god jakob had the fight.and jabbob ,wounded jakob in that fight .jabbob went away and jabbob came back to jakob and said you fought wis humen you fought wis god I give you the name ISRAEL as second name.afterward this name ISRAEL was used by the whole tribe of the jakob followers .And that is it and has not much to do with the KKAZARS.that was also told to me by a really relayable RABEY OF COUR... Read More

Like

Ha-Sung H . Chung
3 mos ago

The most impressive passage in Schechter Letter for me begins with line 32: „32- Then said the princes of Khazaria, “Behold, there is a cave in the valley of Tizul. Bring forth for us 33- the books which are there and explain them to us.” And they did so and went 34- into the cave. And behold, there were there Books of the Law of Moses, and the wise men of Israel explained them 35- in accordance with the words which they spake first. 36- Then Israel, together with the men of Khazaria, returned in perfect repentance.” In my view the princes of Khazaria are the nobles of Gök Türk, wise men of Israel are rabbis from Bagdad, Israel in line 36 are Tiele people living in Dagestan at that time. By jointly reading from the Torah, which the Gök Türks were possessing for hundreds of years, their true identity as children of Jacob was revealed to them and they were united in perfect repentance. It’s resembles the incident described in Nehemiah 8: “5 And Ezra opened the book in the sight of all the people; (for he was above all the people;) and when he opened it, all the people stood up: 6 And Ezra blessed the LORD, the great God. And all the people answered, Amen, Amen, with lifting up their hands: and they bowed their heads, and worshipped the LORD with their faces to the ground. 7 Also Jeshua, and Bani, and Sherebiah, Jamin, Akkub, Shabbethai, Hodijah, Maaseiah, Kelita, Azariah, Jozabad, Hanan, Pelaiah, and the Levites, caused the people to understand the law: and the people stood in their place. 8 So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading. 9 And Nehemiah, which is the Tirshatha, and Ezra the priest the scribe, and the Levites that taught the people, said unto all the people, This day is holy unto the LORD your God; mourn not, nor weep. For all the people wept, when they heard the words of the law.“

Like Annotation: Page 1

Huaan Chang
3 mos ago

1. Can you find any relationship between Khazars and Turks from Chinese literatures ? Except guess there is no evidence so far. Maybe Khazars usurp the name of Turk to frighten other people. 2. Can you find any contact between Xiong-nu and Ashina Turks ? Donot all statements in Chinese documents are correct, you must distinguish them if you have profund Chinese historical knowledge and good judgement. 3. 敕勒 is Sauromatians not Tiele. Sauromations migrated from Ukrine steppe to Eastern Asia around middle 4th CE. According to DNA exam. China have about 80 millions Sauromatian descendants. The eastward migration of Sauromatian is an important chapter in the expansion of Western culture to Eastern Asia. Westerners have not known where Sauromatians went after they mysteriously disappeared from the Ukraine Steppe during the mid-4th century CE. Neither did the Chinese know where they had come from. Emperor Tai-zong and his son, Emperor Gao-zong, of the Tang Dynasty were further deliberately misled into believing that they were Siberian, the aboriginal Ding-ling or Tie-le (Oghuz). This important the West-East cultural exchange and the significant impacts the Sauromatians had upon the eastern Asia population has not been previously recognized. The development of power by the Northern Wei Empire, and the establishment of both

Eastern Wei and Western Wei regimes were especially imprinted by the hardships the Sauromatians suffered. Previouslylly obscure oriental nomads, including the Rou-ran and Turks, enjoyed a sudden surge of power after annexed the Sauromatian tribes. This gave them the impetus to establish their own empires. The Sauromatian did not leave written historical document. They did, however, have a relatively highly developed civilization. Whether they nomadized or settled they left a plethora of artifacts in their tomb allowing archaeologists and scholars to extrapolate great quantities of information. Except for a small numbers tribes took another route and migrated to today's Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithusnia, the vast majority of the Sauromatians tribes including Ugri, Ukrainian Scythians, and Roxolani, migrated to Eastern Asia, and most of them eventually settled down in China and became an integral part of the Chinese socity.

Like

Ha-Sung H . Chung
3 mos ago

Thank you for your valuable comments. Your qualification of 敕勒 as Sauromatians is quite interesting. In Chinese und Korean sources they are also referred to as 狄历, 铁勒, 丁零 and they are somehow connected to the Korean state Goryeo. Anyway your comments are very valuable for my study.

Like

Huaan Chang
3 mos ago

Section 5. Why Bei Shi Called Sau-ro Chi-di？ The tribe name "Di-li" (狄歷) first appeared in the "Ko-ch Biography" of Bei Shi. However, it was an illusory tribe fabricated by the compiler of Bei Shi in order to reach the conclusion that Ding-ling was Sau-ro. His reasoning was as follows: Ding-ling = Di-li = Chi-di = Chi-le. Unfortunately, the complier misread Sau-ro as Chi-le. According to Zuo Zhuan (左傳) and its interpretation by Du Yu (杜預), there were six Chi-di tribes: Gao-luo (皋落氏), Qiang-jiu-ru (廧咎如), Lu (潞氏), Jia (甲氏), Liu-yu (留吁) and Duo-chen (鐸辰). They were scattered around the southeastern Shanxi (山西) Province and southwest of today's Hebei (河北) Province. All six tribes were annexed and absorbed by the Jin Kingdom after 593 BCE. Whatever appellations were used—Di (狄), Bai-Di (白狄), and Chi-di (赤狄)—these names all referred to the northern barbarians and particularly to the Zhou people (周人). Li Yuan-shou, the compiler of Bei Shi fabricated the appellation, Di-li, Chi-le (Sau-ro) and Ding-ling were the same people with different transliterations. Furthermore, the right pronunciation of "敕勒" is "Sau-ro," not "Chi-le". The ancient pronunciation of Ding-ling is "Dian-lian" (**顛連**), which means "heaven" in the Xiong-nu language. We can therefore infer that there exists some connection between the Ding-ling language and the

Xiong-nu language. As for “敕勒” (Sau-ro) and “**顛連**” (Dian-lian), their pronunciations and writings are so different that a link between the two is non-existent. Ding-ling is the proper name for the Ding-ling people, who moved to Gan-su Province during early Eastern Han Dynasty (25-26 CE) and were still called Ding-ling until the end of the East Jin Dynasty (405-417 CE). The Sau-ro people migrated from the Trans-Baikal region to Inner Mongolian steppes, naming their new territory the “Sau-ro Steppe” (敕勒川). There is no evidence that Ding-ling had ever changed to Sau-ro or vice versa. Section 6. Why Zhou Shu Changed Sau-ro to Tie-le? When Chinese official historiographers began to compile Zhou Shu in 629 CE, they could not distinguish Sau-ro from Tie-le. Thus, in Chapters 14 and 15, which had been used since 357 CE by Mu-rong Xian-bei, the appellation of Sau-ro (mis-read as ‘Chi-le’), was arbitrarily changed to Tie-le. During the middle Tang Dynasty when Du You (735-812 CE) was editing Tong Dian (通典), he further noted that Tie-le was a corruption of Sau-ro; that is, the terms Sau-ro and Tie-le were identical. In the Sung Dynasty when Ouyang Hsiu (1007-1072 CE) was re-compiling the New Tang Shu, he accepted the idea that Tie-le was Sau-ro, but also misidentified the Uy-ghur (迴紇) of the Tang period as the Wei-he (韋紇) of the Sui period and the Yuan-he (袁紇) or Ko-ch of the Northern Wei period. Modern scholar Yang Jian-luo (1912-1991), also stated that “Biao-he” (表紇), the Ko-ch, was a corrupted form of “Yuan-he,” in his re-edited Wei Shu and Bei Shi, he changed the records concerning the Biao-he tribe into “Yuan-he” in Chapters 2 and 103 of Wei Shu and Chapter 98 of Bei Shi, in order to agree with the accounts in Tai-ping-yu-lan (太平御覽), which was compiled to be read by Emperor Tai-zong (reign 976-997 CE) of the Sung Dynasty. It is imprudent to rewrite historical documents before definitive conclusions are reached. Neither Bei Shi of 659 CE nor Old Tang Shu of 941 CE had any indication that Tie-le was a corrupted form of Sau-ro. The modern scholar Cen Zhong-mian (1886-1961) suggested that “Ko-ch or Sau-ro was at most one branch of Tie-le. They did not encompass all of the tribes of Tie-le, which was a general appellation, not a specific name.” ..... May be you should read my book "The Eastward Migration of the Sauromatians' in English or "敕勒人的東遷 中國歷史最大疑案" in Chinese.

Like

Ha-Sung H . Chung
3 mos ago

If you identify 敕勒 with Sauromatians, known in the West as Sarmatians I can follow most of your derivations. In my opinion, the Sarmatians were also called in Sui Shu as Zhaowu 9 Xing (昭武九姓), known as Yuezhi by Western historians. The majority of the Zhaowu emigrated to Central Asia after the defeat against Xiongnus in Ganzu (177 BC), with the center in Sarmakand, also called Sogdia. This place has borne the name of the Zhouwu since that time. Some stayed in China and fled south: they were called Little Yuezhi (小月支). The An Lushan Rebellion attests to the fact that they had grown again into a great people and played an important role in the history of China. An Lushan was a man from the Zhouwu people. The Zhaowu had a writing culture. Western historians refer to their script as the Sogdian script. The appearance of this script in the Tang world is explained by saying that it was writings of the Sogdian traders. This script shall be is a derivative of the Greek-Bactrian

alphabet. The only problem is that the Sogdian alphabet is older than the Greek alphabet. The Sogdian alphabet is a direct descendant of the Phoenecian alphabet like the Old Turkish runic writing. The Zhaowu were not unsuccessful in Europe. They founded kingdoms as Sarmatians, Russians (Roxalani), Alans, Allemanns, Catalans (= Goth-Alans). Indeed, you are right about their fate in China. Too little is known about them. The history of the Yuezhi and Xiongnu and Korea has been carefully falsified or erased. This makes your research on Sauro all the more important.

Like

Huaan Chang
3 mos ago

The Sarmatians in China is translated as 沙勒, they are not Yuezhi or Sogidian, In the West two spellings existed for ”Sau-ro;” one is the Greek “Sauromatae” and the other, the Latin “Sarmatae.” Herodotus (484-425 BCE) in Histories (4.21) first used Sauromatae in the 5th century BCE. In 2nd century CE, the Greek geographer Pausan also used Sauromatae in his Description of Greece (1.21.5-6). On the other hand, Greek historian Polybios (203-120 BCE) (25.2) and Roman historian Tactitus (56-117 CE) referred to the tribe as “Sarmatae”. Western researchers have been bewildered by the two spellings, as they do not know for sure if they refer to the same or different peoples. Because of this confusion, Western researchers have assumed three different views: 1. The Greek historian Pliny the Elder (23-79 CE) (4.25) and the Gothic historian Jordanes (6th century CE) held the view that Greek Sauromatae is identical to the Latin Sarmatae. 2. According to the former Soviet Union historian M. I. Roslevtzeffi, Sauromatae and Sarmatae have anything in common except for the superficial similarity in their names. 3. Russian archaeologist B. N. Grakov noted that Sauromatae and Sarmatae were different tribes at first before they merged into Sarmatae. The greatest recorded territory stretched from the Vistula River to the mouth of the Danube and eastward to the Volga, all the way north to the Polar Circle and southward to the shores of the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea. Roaming on this great expanse, the ethnic features of their tribes became diffused in the geographical distributions; thus, the dialects arose. I think that Sauromatae and Sarmatae carry the same meaning but are two pronunciations in two dialects. In the 5th century BCE, the tribes which lived on the east bank of the Don River could be the Ugri; they pronounced their tribe name as Sauromatae. From the 2nd century BCE to 1st century CE the tribes nomadizing in the Danube area were the Iazyges who pronounced their tribe name as Sarmatae. In 4th century CE, the tribes that lived in the Trans-Baikal area could also be the Ugri, as they pronounced their tribe name Sauromatae, as did the Roxolani who lived between the Dnieper River and the Don in 2nd century CE. Strabo (63/64 BCE-24 CE) mentioned Sarmatians in a number of places, but did not comment much about them. He also uses both Sarmatai and Sauromatai, but never together, and he has never suggested that they are different peoples. Although Strabo has used the term Iazyges Sarmatian (IV 17), he has never associated Sarmatian with Ugri or Roxolani. The reason may be that the Iazyges pronounced their tribe name, Sarmatae, while the Urgi and Roxolani pronounced theirs Sauromatae. As the Roxolazni lived near Greece, between the Danbue and Dniper in the 2nd century, this may be the reason Pausanis used the appellation

Sauromatae in his writings. This could also explain why Ammianus Marcellinus termed the Iazyges tribes that lived in Hungary as Sarmatian (17.12.2) while the Ugri, Scythian and Roxolani tribes that lived between the lower reaches of the Danbue River and the Don River were Sauromatae (31.2.13). From the writings of Russian archaeologists I have found that, in general, they do not know the relationship between Sauromatian and Sarmatian. From M. I. Roslevtzeffi forward, Russians have mis-identified the Alans and the Aorsi kurgans in southern Ural steppes as "Sauromatian" or "Sarmatian" kurgans. This is why M. I. Roslevtzeffi negated the possibility of genetic tie between Sauromatian and "Sarmatian," as he thought "Sarmatians" came from the east and hence were Iranian in origin, and their culture bore the Iranian features. In 1988 the Russian archaeologist, M. A. Ochir-Goryayevaz, conducted a comparative analysis on the burial complexes of the 6th-4th centuries BCE in the lower Volg River region and southern Ural steppe region. Criteria used in her study included a few main cultural traits such as burial rites, hand-modeled pottery, and weapons. On the grounds of established difference, the author postulated the existence of two different archaeological cultures, one in the lower Volga River area and the other in the southern Ural steppe region. K. F. Smirnov, the Russian archaeologist also noticed the great similarity between the "animal style" art found in the southern Ural steppe and that of the Saka-Massagetae, illustrated by the paucity of fighting animal scenes and geometric patterns. B. N. Grakov proposed that Sauromatian and "Sarmatian" had ethnogenetic ties, and that the merger of the Sauromatian tribes and the original "Sarmatian" tribes created a single Sarmatian tribe. However, these notions, I presume, were based on misreading of traditional western literatures and mis-interpretation of archaeological data. Section 2. The Sau-ro State in Kachgar, Xinjiang When Zhang Qian (張騫) was sent as the first envoy of the Han dynasty to the Western Regions in 129 BCE, a small country, the "疏勒" state, already existed. The caucasoids had been established the state in today's Ka-shi (Kachgar) in southwestern Xinjiang. For the pronunciation of Ka-shi, The Grand Dictionary of Han Characters cited the chapter "Yu Division" (豫部) of Shuo Wen Tong Xun Ding Sheng (說文通訓定聲) by Zhu Jun-sheng (朱駿聲) and said, "The character '疏' is a phonetic loan character which can be borrowed as '搜'." Moreover, the dictionary Ci Hai (辭

Unlike 1

Ha-Sung H . Chung
3 mos ago
You deserve my fullest admiration, sir.

Like

Huaan Chang
3 mos ago

very happy to have opportunity to exchange views with you.

Like

Huaan Chang
3 mos ago

you may pay some attention to the Sauromatians as Korea has 5% Sauromatian descendants, their Y-DNA N, same as Finn.

Unlike 1

Ha-Sung H . Chung
3 mos ago

In this paper I try to find an answer to the important question whether the Khazars were Israelites or just Turks converted into Judaism while analysing contempory sources, mainly the Schechter Letter and Sui Shu.

Like

Dr.Klaus Singethan
3 mos ago

So much sorry am I,but you are not on the true track about the israelis an the jews.I had the chance to have a very intense discussion with a JEWIS Priest ,means a Rabey.He said the real truth is because the JEWS and the Israelits have most of the backward times have been two tribes separate tribes,who got connected in peace in Jerusalem (PALESTINE)and there fore the OLD TESTAMENT was dictatet to MOSES by JAVE the ONLY GOOD who exists in the whole UNIVERS so for ever. Maybe this RABEY was wrong!? I do not know!But he insisted he has the true knowledge .That was back in the fifties in AUSTRALIA as I was a resident there.

Like

Mohammad Mushfequr Rahman
3 mos ago

Thanks for invite. I would add: Zionism often use the defense of Jewish heritage and connection with Palestine. However, the Jew of Bible is not the same as a Zionist. A biblical Jew is a biological, ethnic and geographic identity, mainly someone who is a member of the tribe and kingdom of Judah, so today we only have spiritual Jews and not the biblical Jews . The distinction between Biblical Jews and spiritual Jews is an important one when it comes to Biblical covenant of God with the Israelites and their claim to Palestine. This is why many orthodox Jews reject the statehood of Israel because they say only the Messiah who is an Israelite, and a direct descendant of Abraham can claim on God's promise land. What happened to the Israelites? The Biblical Jews i.e. the Israelites dispersed into Europe and the middle east such as Roman empire, Syria, Arabia Iran etc. and over the centuries they converted, absorbed into the native population and migrated in and out from Palestine. For example, the Kingdom of Israel was crushed by the Assyrians (722 BCE) and its people carried off into exile and oblivion. Over a hundred years later, Babylonia conquered the Kingdom of Judah, exiling most of its inhabitants as well as destroying Jerusalem and the Temple (586 BCE). These middle eastern people who are overwhelmingly Muslims today are thus the closest to the descendants of the Israelites. Also consider the fact that ancient Philistines were too absorbed into the native middle eastern population. Even for the Israelites they were never natives of Palestine . Who are the modern-day Jews? Much of them are from Ashkenazi and western Turkic Khazar people. "Ashkenaz" in Hebrew refers to Germany, and Ashkenazi Jews are those who originated in Eastern Europe . Research has also identified "ancient Ashkenaz," as a region in northeastern Turkey that harbors four primeval villages whose names resemble Ashkenaz and research findings are compatible with the hypothesis of an Irano-Turko-Slavic origin for Ashkenazi Jews and a Slavic origin for their Yiddish language . The most striking characteristic of the Khazar was the apparent adoption of Judaism by the khagan and the greater part of the ruling class between 740 and 920 CE . After their conversion it is reported that they adopted the Hebrew script . The conversion of Khazar to Judaism is reported by external sources and in the Khazar Correspondence . The conversion started with the elites and then followed by the masses. It is thus clear the Biblical covenant does not apply to modern-day Jews. From: https://www.academia.edu/45005517/Prosecuting_Israel_and_The_Zionists

Like

Ha-Sung H . Chung
3 mos ago

Thank you for joining. I will study your infomation.

Like

Israel Palchan
3 mos ago

From Wikipedia "In August 2012, Dr. Harry Ostrer in his book Legacy: A Genetic History of the Jewish People, summarized his and other work in genetics of the last 20 years, and concluded that all major Jewish groups share a common Middle Eastern origin.[9] Ostrer also refuted the Khazar theory of Ashkenazi ancestry.[10] "

Like

Mohammad Mushfequr Rahman
3 mos ago

Sharing is not same as direct descendant. However In 2013 Dr Eran Elhaik rejected the Rhineland hypothesis as supported by Dr Ostrer. Recent studies of 2014 and 2017 also reject the Ostrer hypothesis. Please read the latest researches referenced in my article which state modern Jews are Ashkenazi and Khazari and reject the Rhineland Levantine hypthesis.

Like

Israel Palchan
3 mos ago

From your up included Paper references: "The inferred ancestry profile for AJs was 5% Western Europe, 10% Eastern Europe, 30% Levant, and 55% Southern Europe (a Near East ancestry was not considered by the authors). Elhaik (2013) portrayed a similar profile for European Jews, consisting of 25–30% Middle East and large Near Eastern–Caucasus (32–38%) and West European (30%) ancestries" 30% Levant seems to be high value for so ancient component. Certainly enough to prove the presence in Levant region 2-3000 years ago. It would be strange to find such % in average European or Turkish people DNA research. Also I am sure that Russian and even Iranian people don't present such Levant DNA influence.

Like

Mohammad Mushfequr Rahman
3 mos ago

30% not enough to claim to be direct descendant of the Israelites and also because other ethnicities are mixed mostly Europeans 55 Percent. As I stated in that paper what happened to the Israelites..this is what happened 70% loss of Abraham's DNA and substituted with the European ethnicities.

Like

Mohammad Mushfequr Rahman
3 mos ago

I would also add that a levantine partial origin does not necessarily subscribe today's Jews with Israelites. Levantines consisted of not only Israelites but also other ethnicities such as Philistines, Phoenicians Assyrians etc etc...These ethnicities were genetically and culturally more or less similar. Is it not reasonable that all these ethnicities living in the same place did not marry each other? Bible says Israelites turned into idol worship and accepted the culture of the pagans which would imply they also married across ethnicities outside Israelites

Like

Israel Palchan
3 mos ago

Dear Mohammed. Thanks the God everybody likes somebody. You work or learned in Derby. How many modern English people have Anglo-Saxon roots? Please see Internet: The present-day English owe about a third of their ancestry to the Anglo-Saxons, according to a new study. Scientists sequenced genomes from 10 skeletons unearthed in eastern England and dating from the Iron Age through to the Anglo-Saxon period. Many of the Anglo-Saxon samples appeared closer to modern Dutch and Danish people than the Iron Age Britons did. The results appear in Nature Communications journal.

Like

Israel Palchan
3 mos ago

I don't find the ethnicity of Khazars most interesting. The fact is however that their descendants are divided between two main ethnicities Slavic and Turkish that seems to be active yet in Khazar empire and continue after it. Could there be also Semitic Jewish ethnicity involved in descendants as Ashcenazic Jews is not clear yet from biological research. The model proposed in this publication that Israelites from ancient Israel state reached China and attached Turks on their historic way to Khazaria seems not proved and is highly suspective. Yet it should be remarked that Israelites have been part of Mesopotamia world and may be part of Amorites, one of two main Mesopotamia euthenics . This big ethnicity also is proposed by some scholars as base for Aramaic people that had occupied wide territories from North Mesopotamia to Levant until Caliphates of Arabs. It is possible that some families or communities of these North Semitic tribes have been reached Khazar places yet before Turks inside Persian empire and may be connecting to Silk Trade with China. They had prolonged

history of religious believes but at the Middle age times when the Khazars born to known history only two main Jewish originated believes were exposed to use : Judaism and Christianity. Khazars chief choose Judaism for themselves and permit Christianity and new born Islam. It is not evidence that they were Jewish origin at all. but yes it is evidence for importance of Jewish community and religion in their live. That significant influence could came only from long and stable cultural contacts between significant part of Khazars, Slavs or Turks, with North west Semitic word. The prolonged contacts of such are not known for Turks and Semits in ancient times but they are known for Indo Europeans which could include protoslavic families. Thats why we can propose Slavic people as originally Khazars that had absorbed Turkish Ashine tribe and give them the head role in their empire. Iranian influence on Slavic languages is well known. There are historians that speak about Iranian Slavic tribes. At Middle age times Iranian culture was obviously anti christiania character. Taking this into the mind the only possibility to choose the monoteistic religion for Iranian influenced people was Judaism. That was done. # hundred years later Russian Vikings knight will choose Christianity for himself and for his slavic patrials . But he was not Slavic ' he was Norman.

Like

Ha-Sung H . Chung
3 mos ago

Thank you very much for your attention and your insightful statement. I agree in full with your view that it is very difficult to differentiate between so many ethnicity and people in the vast territory discribed in my paper. The intention of my paper is to show that Khazaria is the tip of an iceberg of the great nation Israel. This nation has multiplied in the Chinese continent. Part of them left China as Yuezhis, Xingnus, Turks, Awars, Serbs, Sassanites. The leftovers in Asia have also grown to mighty nations: Qing Chinese, Korean, Japan, Vietnam etc.. So God fulfilled his promise made to Abraham: Make him a father of many nations.

Like

Dr.Klaus Singethan
3 mos ago

Since in the BACKWARD TIMES all and everything was very confused and only the ROBERIES of WEMEN by MEN with the wishes and craves for SEXUAL HABITS AND ROBBERIES BRUTALY FORCED AGAINST WEMEN ,the wemen have been mostly left allone with ther prgnancy,the children had been born and kept mostly with the femals what so ever ,NOBODY had known their FATHER- ANCCESTORS REALLY.But one THING is for sure::--- KHAZARS have never been ISRAELITES and/or JUWIS.THAT IS FOR SURE. THE BIBLE SAYINGS PSALMS AND

COMENTS are another ITEM IN the OLD T.AND the NEW T:;and are very less components with BLOOD LINES and heritages!!!!! all the BEST DR:KLAUS

Like

Dr.Klaus Singethan
3 mos ago

The KHazars are the KHazars and it has heppend the some Khazars after their defeit turned to the old Testament of the Jews like the Rothschield,s they are partly Khazars,with old testamental visiones.The Khazars have been defeeted by Russo tribs so in the old ages.the Khazars migrated after their defeet sothwards mor to the Agypten border.That,s what Igot to know about this Khazars.best greetings DR.KLAUS.

Like

Ha-Sung H . Chung
3 mos ago

Thank you for input. Indeed Khzars were defeated by Russ, but not expelled by them. It were the Mongols which caused them to flee. Since the Mongols went also to Egypt it would not helped the Khazars to flee to there. Archelogical finds in Ukraine and Eastern Europe prove Khazarians movement to this territory sufficiently.

Like

Jaka Vanindo
3 mos ago

It is a long paper but interesting to read. I wonder if the author finds the linkage between the Khazarians Turks and Alexander the Great around the black sea.

Like

Ha-Sung H . Chung
3 mos ago

Thanks for reading. An interesting input. I am sure there is some link since the territory of Gök Turks included the Ferghana Valley and Bactria.